BARRY BALDWIN

STUDIES ON GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY AND LITERATURE

Valparaiso
University
Libraries

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/studiesongreekro0000bald

STUDIES ON GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY AND LITERATURE

LONDON STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

edited by

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

Volume Fifteen

STUDIES ON GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY AND LITERATURE

by

BARRY BALDWIN

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

J.C. GIEBEN, PUBLISHER
AMSTERDAM 1985

ISBN 90 70265 09 5
Printed in The Netherlands

PA
3003
.B35
1985

To: Janet,
Martha,
Alexander – Who cried, "Not More!"

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

212734

PREFACE

This volume contains a representative selection of articles written over the last twenty years or so on various aspects of Greek and Roman history and literature. In an informal way, it is a companion to my *Studies On Late Roman and Byzantine History, Literature and Language* (J.C. Gieben, Amsterdam, 1984). The papers are grouped together in various and tolerably homogeneous sections. Most are specialised, though some were born as lectures or discussion papers designed for that elusive beast, the general reader.

Apart from gratifying the author's ego, and giving readers the convenience of work from disparate sources assembled between the same covers, such collections have value in showing how an individual writer's perceptions of a crucial period of history, chronologically vast and of infinite detail, grow and develop over decades of teaching, research, and debate. In deciding what to include, I have given large preference to things that have received the compliment of published reactions from fellow scholars, favourable and critical. The fact that I have not tampered with the original texts does not mean that I have not changed my mind on this detail or that. I hope rather than fear that this is apparent. No honest scholar deludes himself that he got it all right the first time – if ever. And only a fool boasts of never changing his mind. In any case, the articles themselves naturally provide their own modifications of view and updating of bibliography.

Last and best, I thank Mr. Han Gieben for providing me with the pleasure of making this collection, and thereby a further honorific association for myself with the distinguished publishing firm of J.C. Gieben.

Barry Baldwin

CONTENTS

GREEK HISTORY

I How credulous was Herodotos? 3
Greece & Rome 11 (1964) 167-177

II Herodotus and Tacitus: Two Notes on Ancient Book Titles 14
Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica 16 (1984) 31-34

III Cleon's Strategy at Amphipolis 18
Acta Classica 11 (1968) 211-214

IV Notes on Hyperbolus 22
Acta Classica 14 (1971) 151-156

V Notes on Cleophon 28
Acta Classica 17 (1974) 35-47

VI Medical Grounds for Exemptions from Military Service at Athens 41
Classical Philology 62 (1967) 42-43

GREEK EPIGRAM

VII The Use of *Binein Kinein* 45
American Journal of Philology 102 (1981) 79-80

VIII More Love with Doris 47
Mnemosyne 33 (1980) 357-359

IX Asclepiades AP V 210 50
Emerita 50 (1982) 145-149

X Rufinus AP 5 60 55
Journal of Hellenic Studies 100 (1980) 192-194

XI Notes on Rufinus 60
Phoenix 34 (1980) 337-346

XII Notes on the Language of Greek Epigrams 70
Acta Classica 26 (1983) 95-99

EROTICA

XIII Aquatic Sex 77
Liverpool Classical Monthly 6 (1981) 25

XIV CIL IV 6892 78
Emerita 49 (1981) 145-148

XV Catullan Interpretations: Some Pointers 82
Corolla Londiniensis 2 (1982) 9-13

XVI Horace on Sex 87
American Journal of Philology 91 (1970) 460-465

XVII Eros in Graeco-Roman Society and Literature 93
Mosaic 1 (1968) 27-42

SENECA

XVIII Seneca and Petronius 111
Acta Classica 24 (1981) 133-140

XIX Executions under Claudius: Seneca's *Ludus De Morte Claudii* 119
Phoenix 18 (1964) 39-48

XX Seneca's *Potentia* 129
Classical Philology 65 (1970) 187-188

PETRONIUS

XXI Trimalchio's Domestic Staff 133
Acta Classica 21 (1978) 87-97

XXII *Ira Priapi* 144
Classical Philology 68 (1973) 294-296

XXIII Petronius and the Fire of Rome 147
Maia 28 (1976) 35-36

XXIV Opimian Wine 149
American Journal of Philology 88 (1967) 173-175

XXV A Note on Trimalchio's Zodiac Dish 152
Classical Quarterly 20 (1970) 363

XXVI Trimalchio's Corinthian Plate 153
Classical Philology 68 (1973) 46-47

XXVII Petronius 34.10 155
Maia 31 (1979) 145

XXVIII Trimalchio and Maecenas 156
Latomus 43 (1984) 402-403

XXIX Petronius' Tryphaena 158
Eranos 74 (1976) 53-57

XXX Two Notes on Petronius 163
Classical World 69 (1976) 377-378

XXXI Echion's Profession in the *Satyricon* 165
Rivista di Filologia 104 (1976) 327-328

XXXII *Pax Palamedes* 167
Classical Philology 69 (1974) 293-294

XXXIII *Pigiciaca Sacra.* A Fundamental Problem in Petronius? 169
Maia 30 (1978) 119-121

XXXIV *Penthiacum*: a Culinary Term in Petronius 172
Glotta 55 (1977) 252-253

JUVENAL

XXXV Cover-Names and Dead Victims in Juvenal 177
Athenaeum 45 (1967) 304-312

XXXVI Three Characters in Juvenal 186
Classical World 66 (1972) 101-104

XXXVII Juvenal's Crispinus 190
Acta Classica 22 (1979) 109-114

XXXVIII Juvenal 1. 155-7 196
Classical Quarterly 29 (1979) 162-164

XXXIX Turnus the Satirist 199
Eranos 77 (1979) 57-60

TACITUS

XL Executions, Trials, and Punishment in the Reign of Nero 205
Parola del Passato 117 (1967) 425-439

XLI Themes, Personalities, and Distortions in Tacitus 220
Athenaeum 52 (1974) 70-81

XLII Tacitean Humour 232
Wiener Studien 11 (1977) 128-144

XLIII Possible Horatian Echoes in Tacitus 249
Wiener Studien 13 (1979) 144-150

XLIV Women in Tacitus 256
Prudentia 4 (1972) 83-101

XLV Three Notes on Tacitus, *Histories* 1 275
Maia 33 (1981) 43-44

XLVI Apuleius, Tacitus and Christians 277
Emerita 52 (1984) 1-3

XLVII Nero and his Mother's Corpse 280
Mnemosyne 32 (1979) 380-381

XLVIII The Hapless Helmsman 282
Classical Journal 65 (1970) 322-323

AULUS GELLIUS

XLIX Aulus Gellius and his Circle 287
Acta Classica 16 (1973) 103-107

L Aulus Gellius on Vergil 292
Vergilius 19 (1973) 22-27

LI An Anonymous Latin Poem in Gellius 298
Arctos 13 (1979) 5-13

LUCIAN

LII The Authorship and Purpose of Lucian's *Demosthenis Encomium* 309
Antichthon 3 (1969) 54-62

LIII The Epigrams of Lucian 318
Phoenix 29 (1975) 311-335

LIV Lucian on Poetry 343
Prudentia 5 (1973) 117-126

LV Lucian and Europa: Variations on a Theme 353
Acta Classica 23 (1980) 115-119

LVI Lucian and Theophrastus 358
Mnemosyne 30 (1977) 174-176

LVII Lucian, *De Hist. Conscrib.* 34: An Unnoticed Aristotelian Source 361
Philologus 121 (1977) 165-168

LVIII Four Observations on the *Pro Lapsu Salutandi* of Lucian 365
Maia 35 (1983) 49-50

LIX Crepereius Calpurnianus 367
Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica 27 (1977) 211-213

LX The Date and purpose of the *Philopatris* 370
Yale Classical Studies 27 (1982) 321-344

LXI The scholiasts' Lucian 394
Helikon 20/21 (1980/81) 219-234

LXII The Date of Alciphron 410
Hermes 110 (1982) 253-254

LXIII The First and Only 412
Glotta 62 (1984) 58-59

ATHENAEUS

LXIV Athenaeus and his Work 417
Acta Classica 19 (1976) 21-42

LXV The Minor Characters in Athenaeus 439
Acta Classica 20 (1977) 37-48

ROMAN SOCIAL HISTORY

LXVI Two Aspects of the Spartacus Slave Revolt 453
Classical Journal 62 (1967) 289-294

LXVII The *Acta Diurna* 459
Chiron 9 (1979) 189-203

LXVIII Rulers and Ruled at Rome: AD 14-192 474
Ancient Society 3 (1972) 149-163

LXIX Power corrupts – and absolute power is even nicer: some thoughts on recent assessments of the Roman Emperors 489
Liverpool Classical Monthly 9 (1984) 102-105

LXX The Sports Fans of Rome and Byzantium 493
Liverpool Classical Monthly 9 (1984) 28-30

LXXI Poems on Memnon 496
Prudentia 15 (1983) 53-57

LXXII *Polyphagus*: Glutton or Crocodile? 501
American Journal of Philology 98 (1977) 406-409

LXXIII Crime and Criminals in Graeco-Roman Egypt 505
Aegyptus 3/4 (1963) 256-263

LXXIV Strikes in the Roman Empire 513
Classical Journal 59 (1963) 275-276

LXXV Germaine Greer and the Female Artists of Greece and Rome 515
Echos du Monde Classique/Classical News and Views 25 (1981) 18-21

ROMAN LITERATURE

LXXVI *Bos Piger* or *Piger Caballus*? 521
Greece & Rome 20 (1973) 122-123

LXXVII Vergil, Eclogue IV.61: A Reply 523
Classical Journal 64 (1969) 280

LXXVIII The Death of Cleopatra VII 524
Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 50 (1964) 181-182

LXXIX Columella's Sources and how he used them 526
Latomus 22 (1963) 785-791

LXXX The Authorship of the *Aratus* ascribed to Germanicus 533
Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica 7 (1981) 163-172

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LXXXI The Second Century from Secular Sources 545
The Second Century 1 (1981) 173-189

LXXXII Late Antiquity: A Review Article 562
Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views 28 (1984) 57-68

Index 573

GREEK HISTORY

I

HOW CREDULOUS WAS HERODOTUS?

THIS title is redolent of *crambe repetita*, and nobody is more aware of this fact than the present writer. Herodotos enjoyed an almost universally bad press from ancient critics for his alleged mendacity and gullibility, and his lack of the scientific spirit of historiography when compared with Thucydides. Modern critics, though more reasonable, have often tended to agree with this damning verdict, or at least to assume the superiority of Thucydides as unquestionable. A few years ago, however, the case for Herodotos was cogently stated by Arnaldo Momigliano in an inspiring article in *History*.[1] I should like merely to set down and discuss again some examples of what Herodotos himself really says about his sources and methods, in the hope of assisting Momigliano's work of rehabilitation.

I confine my examples to Herodotos' first four books, with particular reference to Book ii on Egypt. This method may be open to criticism, but my reasons are simple; the subject-matter of these books abounds with the colourful tales which have earned our author the opprobrium of critics, and so are ideal for my purpose. Also, as the recent books on the Persian Wars by Burn and Hignett are not available in Australia (at the time of writing), I feel this limitation to be desirable (at least for the present).

Herodotos opens his first book by recounting the large number of rapes and counter-rapes by Greeks, Phoenicians, and Persians. He handles his dubious theme with delightful irony and a very light hand, which is quite wasted on Plutarch or whoever wrote the *De malignitate Herodoti*,[2] since he is castigated in this pamphlet for approving rape, but concludes with the comment, 'so much for what Persians and Phoenicians say; I have no intention of passing judgement on its truth or falsity.

[1] Judicious remarks on Herodotos are made in W. W. How and J. Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912), xx, xxxiv, xliii; T. R. Glover, *Herodotus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1924), 66–75; W. G. Waddell's edition of Herodotos, Book ii (London, 1939), Introduction; J. L. Myres, *Herodotus, Father of History* (Oxford, 1953), 17–31. Momigliano's article is 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography', *History*, xliii (1958), 1–13.

[2] This pamphlet is discussed by the above authorities. I would regard it as a genuine example of Plutarch's obtuseness; Boeotian stupidity may not have been so exaggerated by the Athenians! It has been very well said of this pamphlet, considered as a slashing review, that 'the author set out to commit murder but only succeeded in suicide'.

I prefer to rely on my own knowledge'.[1] A little later, when recounting Alyattes' embassy to the Delphic oracle, he gives the version of the story 'known to myself', but scrupulously adds a detail from the Milesian accounts.[2] In beginning his account of the exploits of Cyrus, he hastens to give credit to the Persian authorities, whom he finds to be 'least exaggerated'.[3] This pleasant feature of acknowledging sources will be seen to be a constant refrain in his book on Egypt, where such a procedure is especially vital. For the moment, I defer discussion on this, and pass on to Books iii and iv.

The exordium to Book iii gives three possible reasons for the invasion of Egypt by Cambyses. The Persian account is given without comment, the Egyptian version is recorded and denied,[4] and the third story, which is a current anecdote rather than an official story, is described as 'unconvincing'[5] but reported nevertheless. When relating how the Arabian king filled the Egyptian army's water skins, in chapter 9, he describes the simplest version, referring to filling camel skins and loading them on to camels, as πιθανώτερος τῶν λόγων, but comments on the silly alternative story that a camel-skin conduit was strung from the river Korys to the desert, δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἧσσον πιθανὸν ῥηθῆναι. After a series of remarkable stories about the flying snakes of Arabia,[6] the sheep whose long tails are supported by little carts, and the like, Herodotos then warns his audience that he has no respectable information about the far west of Europe.[7] He rejects the story of the river Eridanos as the

[1] i. 5. I refer throughout to the Oxford Text of C. Hude.

[2] i. 19. 3. Δελφῶν οἶδα ἐγὼ οὕτω ἀκούσας γενέσθαι. Μιλήσιοι δὲ τάδε προστιθεῖσι τούτοισι, κτλ.

[3] i. 95. 1. ὡς ὧν Περσέων μετεξέτεροι λέγουσι, οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι σεμνοῦν . . . ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω.

[4] iii. 1–3. The Persian account involves the deception of Cambyses by Amasis, who sent Nitetis, daughter of the late king Apries, to Cambyses in lieu of his own daughter. The Egyptian account made Cambyses son of Nitetis and therefore an Egyptian himself; of this version Herodotos comments λέγοντες . . . οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγουσι.

[5] This story, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιθανός, claims that at the age of ten years Cambyses promised his mother that he would 'turn Egypt upside down'.

[6] The flying snakes of Arabia represent one of Herodotos' most famous anecdotes. In ii. 75 he says that he went to Buto (not the Buto of the Delta, but apparently near the Bitter Lakes; see How and Wells, and Waddell, ad loc.) to inquire about these. The snakes have been variously explained as locusts, tree lizards, or creatures of mythology. Waddell says that 'the wings appear to be an addition from a traveller's tale'. The editors quote Isaiah xxx. 6: 'the land of trouble and anguish, from whence come . . . the viper and fiery flying serpent'. But see now R. W. Hutchinson, 'The Flying Snakes of Arabia', *Classical Quarterly*, N.S., vii (1957), 100 f., where Herodotos receives new and powerful support.

[7] iii. 115. 1.

supposed source of amber, because the word Eridanos is 'obviously not foreign but Greek'; he has tried in vain to get information about the northern sea into which this river is said to flow.[1] He is sceptical about the existence of the Kassiterides, and has no belief at all in the one-eyed Arimaspians! Reverting to soberer topics, he gives two versions of the attempt by the Persian satrap Oroites to kill Polykrates of Samos; he indicates his own preference by alleging that his second version is less current, but stresses that his reader must decide for himself.[2]

The Scythian sections of Book iv show Herodotos at his critical best. Three accounts of Scythian origins are put forward. The Scythian derivation from Targitos, son of Zeus, and a daughter of the river Borysthenes, is treated with perhaps modest scorn;[3] the Greek tales of Herakles and the viper-woman are retailed without comment (is any needed?); the nomadic explanation, forced migration and the like, is put forward as his own preferred version.[4] In this context we have a very good example of Herodotos' treatment of poetry as source material; he adduces the poem of Aristeas against the Scythian version of their origins, although Aristeas believes in the one-eyed Arimaspians. But when Aristeas admits that he knows nothing about the land beyond the Issedones except gossip and fancy, Herodotos abandons him as a source, and says that he will set down all that he has found by laborious research, despite the regrettable paucity of eyewitness evidence.[5]

The mysterious bald Argippaioi are described with attention and some respect by Herodotos, but he admits that beyond their region is a land of which nothing is known. He ridicules the tales told by the Argippaioi of men living there with goat feet, and men who sleep for six months of each year.[6] The succeeding sections of the *Skythiaka* show Herodotos in a variety of moods. He rationalizes tales of feathers falling in such quantity as to obnubilate the atmosphere by saying that this is mere snowfall. On the legendary Hyperboreans he comments sarcastically that, if such exist, there must needs be Hypernotians also. He pours open ridicule on the cartographers who depict Okeanos girdling the earth, with Europe and Asia shown as equal in size.[7] He is sceptical of Phoenician claims to have circumnavigated Africa, too much so in the

[1] iii. 115. 2.
[2] iii. 122. 1.
[3] iv. 5. 1. ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες.
[4] iv. 11. 1.
[5] iv. 17. 2.
[6] On the goat-footed men he comments ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες; on the men who sleep for six months a year, οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι ἀρχήν.
[7] iv. 36. 2.

light of modern knowledge, but deliberately invites his readers to disagree with his attitude.[1] He is extremely hesitant about the nature of Europe, saying that there is no real information available,[2] and confesses himself bewildered about the origins of the names for Europe, Asia, and Libya.[3] Of the two versions of the death of Anarcharsis, the Peloponnesian version is dismissed as a 'Greek fabrication'.[4] In view of his notorious inability to handle figures (a vice common to most ancient historians), it is pleasing to find him cautious about conflicting estimates of the Scythian population, and trying here to utilize archaeology as an aid to knowledge.[5] He is frankly unable to make up his mind about the Greek story of Salmoxis as the slave of Pythagoras and his trick of the underground cavern,[6] so much so that he dismisses the topic with an exasperated (?) χαιρέτω. Back in the realm of the fabulous, he scorns the story of lycanthropy amongst the Neuroi, and declines to generalize about the prevalence of the Libyan practice of cauterizing the veins of children's heads to prevent catarrh; he admits their unusual good health, without conceding the cauterizing as the reason, and he is certainly sceptical about the efficacy of goat urine against convulsions resulting from the cauterizing! Tales about dog-headed and headless men are referred to as purely Libyan in origin. The famous story about girls bringing up gold dust from the bed of a lake with feathers smeared in pitch is doubted; but Herodotos is fair enough to adduce a similar phenomenon for lakes in Zakynthos as a possible analogy.[7] In general, Herodotos lays great stress on the depth of his own research into all these topics,[8] suggesting that he was far from happy with the quality of the available information.

I now turn to Book ii which I discuss in detail. I hope to show that this book shows him at his best as a critical historian, not at his worst, as many writers allege. Herodotos' own celebrated remark, 'Egypt has more wonderful and memorable things than any other country',[9] indicates his line of approach. In discussing his treatment of a subject that

[1] iv. 42. 4.
[2] iv. 45. 1.
[3] iv. 45. 2.
[4] iv. 77. 2. λόγος ἄλλως πέπαισται ὑπ' αὐτῶν Ἑλλήνων.
[5] iv. 81. 3. He adduces the huge brazen votive bowl at Exampaeus which he was taken to see, which purported to contain 5,000 gallons capacity and to be made of metal four inches thick, derived from a levy of arrow-heads, one from each of the population.
[6] iv. 96. 1. οὔτε ἀπιστέω οὔτε ὧν πιστεύω τι λίην.
[7] iv. 192. 1.
[8] iv. 192. 3. ἡμεῖς ἱστορέοντες ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἷοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἐξίκεσθαι.
[9] ii. 35. 1.

fatally lends itself to the fabulous, I think we should appeal less to the authority of his ancient critics, and more to modern Egyptologists. Sir Alan Gardiner acutely observes: 'It is largely on account of Herodotos' description of Egypt that charges of mendacity have been levelled against him alike in antiquity and in modern times. In truth there is no reason to impugn his good faith.'[1] Sir Alan is no slavish admirer; he says that Herodotos' account of the older Egyptian monarchy is 'deplorable', that his chronology for Sesostris is 'wildly wrong', and that 'his account of Egyptian religion is disappointing'. But Sir Alan concludes that 'only rarely can he be convicted of definite error'. This is high praise from the doyen of modern Egyptologists, and is worth far more than the wild accusations of a Ktesias, a Manetho, and a Strabo.

Much turns on the oral traditions which Herodotos claims to follow. There has been much discussion over his claims to have talked with the priests at Memphis, Thebes, and Heliopolis. Many deny that he could have done so. Others, admitting the fact of the discussions, assert that such priestly sources were of little worth. Herodotos is quite explicit: 'There were other things that I learned at Memphis in talks with the priests of Hephaistos, and indeed I went to Thebes and Heliopolis to find out if the priests there would tell me the same stories as the Memphite priests. The priests at Heliopolis are said to be the most erudite in matters of antiquity.'[2] This desire to compare the various accounts is itself a great credit to Herodotos' integrity. However, let me quote How and Wells:[3] 'Herodotos came into contact only with the lower classes of Egypt, probably mainly with the half-castes, who acted as interpreters. It is not at all probable that he met the priests, though he claims to have done so, no doubt in all honesty. Maspero, a kindly critic, says this was 'about as likely as that a modern tourist would be shown around Notre Dame by the Archbishop of Paris.' Again, W. Spiegelberg sneers: 'The great princes of the church of that date, in their mandarin-like pride, would certainly not have condescended to talk to an inquisitive Greek.'[4] Sir Alan Gardiner thinks that Herodotos mistook temple underlings for priests.[5]

I contest this scepticism on several grounds. Tourists in Egypt in Ptolemaic and Roman times had no trouble in establishing contact with priests. Germanicus, in his grand tour *antiquitatis cognoscendae*, required

[1] *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Oxford, 1961), 3.
[2] ii. 3. 1.
[3] Op. cit., 413.
[4] I take this remark by Spiegelberg from W. G. Waddell, op. cit., on ii. 2. 28 (p. 120).
[5] Op. cit., 3.

an elder priest at Thebes to provide a translation of the monumental inscriptions there.[1] It is quite true, of course, that Herodotos could not have enjoyed the red-carpet treatment which a Germanicus received. However, Strabo tells us that at Arsinoe the priests were so devoid of mandarin-like pride as to tame and publicly feed the sacred crocodiles for the delight of tourists.[2] If there is any truth in the traditions that Pythagoras, Solon, Plato, and Eudoxos studied at Heliopolis, Herodotos' accolade is both justified and percipient. Strabo says that the college of priests had disappeared from Heliopolis in his time, but their large houses were still to be seen, and one could still consult the religious and interpreters there.[3] Having gone the tourist round in Egypt myself, I doubt whether anyone could mistake a priest in that country, much less confuse him with a dragoman! Herodotos was an experienced tourist. He takes great pride in quoting priestly sources wherever possible,[4] but he knows when he is dealing with a guide. For instance, in reporting the famous story of the Pyramid inscription relating to leeks and radishes, he points out that this dubious translation was provided by an 'interpreter'.[5]

The Egyptologist A. Erman was kinder in commenting: 'What Herodotos himself observed gives us as trustworthy an account as it is possible to obtain from a tourist who, ignorant of the language, travels for a few months in a foreign country.'[6] I think myself that Herodotos was right to respect the erudition and antiquarianism of the Memphite and Heliopolitan priesthoods. There is much truth in the usual generalization that Egyptian religion had, by Herodotos' day, long been ossified into a sentimental looking back to the ancient and vanished glories, but this melancholy fact is in itself a fair guarantee that the priests preserved accurate knowledge of the past. Priests are usually conservative and honest. They may well have withheld much information from Herodotos for reasons of piety, and we can well imagine that Herodotos may have wearied his informants with his insatiable thirst for information (who does not know the importunate tourist?), but I am quite sure that he was both honest and correct in using priestly information as his prime

[1] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 60. mox uisit ueterum Thebarum magna uestigia. et manebant structis molibus litterae Aegyptiae, priorem opulentiam complexae; iussusque e senioribus sacerdotum patrium sermonem interpretari.

[2] *Geog.* xvii. 1. 38.

[3] Ibid. 1. 29. Strabo's terms for these are ἱεροποιοὶ καὶ ἐξηγηταὶ τοῖς ξένοις.

[4] Waddell, on ii. 4. 1, notes that the words ἔλεγον οἱ ἱρέες recur like a refrain.

[5] ii. 125. 6. The word used is ἑρμηνεύς.

[6] I take this from How and Wells, op. cit., 414.

source. Nor was Herodotos the only ancient tourist in Egypt capable of detecting fraudulent information![1]

If we consider some individual sections of Book ii our respect for Herodotos should increase. He is always ridiculed for his alleged credulity in the matter of the inscription on the Great Pyramid of Cheops, which purported to list the leeks, radishes, &c., provided for the workmen. But if we examine his actual words, we find that he attributes the translation to a dragoman, and qualifies it with his own words εἰ δ' ἔστι οὕτως ἔχοντα ταῦτα. He is equally cautious in accepting the unedifying story of Cheops' daughter building a pyramid out of stones collected from her clientele in the brothel to which her avaricious father had consigned her, adding the proviso 'so the story goes' (ἔφασαν). His actual description of the Gizeh Pyramids is praised by no less a person than Flinders Petrie: 'The accuracy with which Herodotos states what he saw and relates what he heard, the criticism he often applies to his materials . . . all this should prevent our ever discrediting his words, unless compelled to do so.'[2] Herodotos emerges with much more credit than his detractor Strabo, who records without a qualm the absurd story that the Pyramid of Mykerinos was built by or for the courtesan Rhodopis,[3] a story explicitly rejected by Herodotos; Strabo also claims to have seen petrified remnants of the food consumed by the builders of the Great Pyramid!

Other examples confirm our argument. He is ultra-cautious in dealing with anecdotes about the phoenix, and expressly dismisses the native story that makes the phoenix carry its parent in a lump of myrrh from Arabia as 'incredible'.[4] He is no less scientific in this respect than Tacitus, if we compare Tacitus' digression on the phoenix and tales associated with this remarkable bird.[5] Despite the sneers of Strabo,[6]

[1] Strabo, *Geog.* xvii. 1. 29, says that Aelius Gallus was accompanied by the Alexandrian Chaeremon, whose pretensions to priestly erudition were exposed as false. For the whole fascinating subject of tourists in Egypt in Classical times see J. G. Milne, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, iii (1916), 76 ff.

[2] Quoted by How and Wells, on ii. 124. 5 (p. 228).

[3] *Geog.* xvii. 1. 33–34. Diodorus (inevitably) and the elder Pliny have this story. How and Wells, also Waddell, connect this with the Arab legend of a lovely naked female who was said to haunt the pyramid of Mykerinos and who drove men mad. Herodotos rejects the Rhodopis stories with one of his usual formulae for disbelief, οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγοντες. [4] ii. 73. 3.

[5] *Ann.* vi. 28. auis Phoenix in Aegyptum uenit praebuitque materiem doctissimis indigenarum et Graecorum multa super eo miraculo disserendi. de quibus congruunt et plura ambigua, sed cognitu non absurda promere libet . . . [on carrying its parent's body] haec incerta et fabulosis aucta.

[6] *Geog.* xvii. 1. 52.

I regard his discussion of the various theories of the origin of the Nile and reasons for the inundation as a model of acumen and honesty. Toynbee selects his discussions of Herakles' origins and of Hellenic and Egyptian chronologies as examples of Greek critical method.[1] There are many astonishing stories retailed without qualification. But it should never be forgotten that Herodotos lays down two binding principles for himself which cover the entire scope of his work. When he touches on the Egyptian custom of regarding animals as sacred, he refrains from explaining this because 'to explain, I should have to enter into a discussion of religious principles, which is a subject I especially wish to avoid'.[2] Further on, having concluded his anecdotes about Rhampsinitos, he says: 'Anyone may believe these Egyptian tales, if he is sufficiently credulous; as for myself, I keep to the general purpose of this book, which is to record the traditions of the various nations just as I heard them related to me.'[3] Nothing could be more unequivocal than that. It may be argued that he does not sufficiently rationalize stories in the style of Thucydides and many modern writers, but is it really any more scientific always to explain away smugly primitive and not so primitive traditions? After all, the cold light of reason has its limitations. How and Wells aptly point out: 'Herodotos is conscious that there is a difference between historic and prehistoric periods; in iii. 122. 2 he contrasts Minos and Polykrates as belonging to different categories; in this respect Thucydides is less scientific than Herodotos, for he, without any reserve, turns Minos into a prehistoric Pericles (i. 4).'

Inevitably we must contrast Herodotos with Thucydides. Even in this most hackneyed of pursuits something worth noting may come to light. On points of detail, the two writers are perhaps more in accord than is often realized. In his famous preface, setting down his criteria for historiography, Thucydides condemns reliance on the accounts of Homer and the poets, sneers at genealogists, prefers autopsy as the best evidence, and lauds his own dissections of popular accounts and the works of his predecessors and contemporaries. Excellent—but so does Herodotos. The difference is that Herodotos does not choose to set down his axioms in such a formal way. His discussion of Egyptian and Homeric accounts of Helen and the Trojan War is a model of sobriety, and we have seen how he used Aristeas. He ridicules the attempts of Hekataios to equip himself with a genealogy extending back to the gods, and he is for ever pointing out his preference for autopsy as the best witness. He is always ready to admit when he is fatally lacking such

[1] *Greek Historical Thought* (Mentor edition, 1952), 169 ff.
[2] ii. 65. 2. [3] ii. 123. 1.

evidence. When dealing with controversial or obscure topics, he will confidently invite his readers to vindicate or amplify his statements by doing the necessary research themselves,[1] or he will frankly confess that he is doing no more than set down the available evidence and making his own conjectures. He is fully capable of handling a set of conflicting accounts and selecting which seems to him the most appropriate.

A celebrated appreciation of Herodotos is that of J. B. Bury.[2] He defines Herodotos' maxims of historiography as follows: 'Suspect superhuman and miraculous occurrences which contradict ordinary experience. But this, in his application of it, leaves a wide room for portents, and it does not cover oracles and dreams.' We may comment that many modern psychologists would not be so cavalier in dismissing dreams, and that some Greeks, at least by the days of Epicurus, made a serious attempt to understand this phenomenon. Again, Bury writes: 'Autopsy and first-hand oral information are superior to stories at second hand, whether written or oral. This tends to take the naïve form "I know, for I was there myself", and it placed the historian at the mercy of the vergers and guides in Egyptian temples.' Bury illustrates this claim by the usual unfair and garbled version of Herodotos and the Pyramid inscription which we have discussed in this article. Bury's statement is desperate pleading. Autopsy in Thucydides is a cardinal virtue (Bury goes on to hail him as the 'first truly critical historian'); in Herodotos it becomes a proof of naïve credulity! I think I have amply demonstrated how cautious Herodotos is in accepting native traditions, how he rejects some, accepts others, and, when in doubt, sets down the alternative versions for his readers to decide. I would maintain that this is a far more scientific and trustworthy method than Thucydides' technique of selection of facts and stories and of foisting bias by suppression of evidence and by smear tactics, as in his treatment of Kleon, which is currently under some criticism.[3]

Ancient criticisms of Herodotos need not perturb. Many writers could dub him *Father of History* and *Liar* in almost the same breath, as Petrarch noted with alarm.[4] Ktesias dubs him ψεύστης καὶ λογοποιός, mild compared with Ktesias' own subsequent reputation for veracity! Manetho accuses Herodotos of making many errors in his Egyptian

[1] e.g., i. 139–40, where he claims that Persian names indicative of physical courage all end in the letter *s* and adds ἐς τοῦτο διζήμενος εὑρήσεις.

[2] *Ancient Greek Historians* (Dover Books, 1958), 69 ff.

[3] See A. G. Woodhead, 'Thucydides' portrait of Kleon', *Mnemosyne*, xiii (1960), 289–317.

[4] See Momigliano, op. cit. 2.

section ὑπ' ἀγνοίας. This is, at least, a valid line of attack. Manetho has suffered much from modern Egyptologists, though I personally set some considerable store by much of his reconstruction of Egyptian chronology. However, to accuse a writer of ignorance on the same subject as oneself is not to accuse him of mendacity or credulity; it is also a standard device to secure recognition for one's own work. It is perfectly legitimate, and is a feature of the articles and reviews of any learned journal. The attack of Plutarch or pseudo-Plutarch, discussed earlier, is as malicious and crass as the attack of Plutarch or pseudo-Plutarch on Aristophanes. Cicero imputes lies and falsifications to Herodotos,[1] but he himself in a notorious letter to Lucceius asks the latter to exaggerate his achievements in a projected monograph on the Catilinarian conspiracy.[2] The reference by Lucian in the *Vera Historia* is at least semi-humorous, and is offset by his treatment in his treatise *How to Write History*. It is ironic that a modern champion of Herodotos should have as his lone ancient supporter the egregious Dionysios of Halikarnassos, whose origin makes him suspect in this context, and whose attacks on Thucydides are puerile in the extreme. Yet the very desperation of his folly may hint at a situation where one or two critics felt the need to re-assess Herodotos and challenge the automatic supremacy of Thucydides.

Fashions in historiography change. Livy used to suffer by comparison with Tacitus, as a matter of course, in precisely the same way as Herodotos. Yet the vogue is now to challenge the most famous Tacitean portrayals, and Livy has at last had a very fine book written on him by an English scholar.[3] The automatic acceptance of Thucydides as the canon is an anachronistic servility to ancient critics. In the twentieth century the Herodotean approach, with his universality of attitude, his transcending of the worst type of national pride and prejudice, his human sympathies, and his joy in telling a good story for its own sake, seems to me more refreshing and desirable than the restricted and cold approach of the son of Oloros.

But why should we have to counterpoise the two writers? They are as different in some respects as the proverbial chalk and cheese, though closer in others than many critics have cared to admit. My purpose is to vindicate Herodotos, not to belittle Thucydides. We ought to be able to read the one without having to keep looking over our shoulders for the other. We can read Gibbon for pleasure; this does not preclude our

[1] *Leg.* i. 5; *Div.* ii. 110.
[2] *Fam.* v. 12.
[3] P. G. Walsh, *Livy* (Cambridge, 1961).

appreciation of Dom David Knowles. This should be our approach to the Greek historians. Subservience to the dicta of Ktesias and Plutarch is inane. As Housman said in another context, 'Parisians in the great siege ate rats. Should lovers of French cooking be thereby condemned to eat rats for ever?'

II

HERODOTUS AND TACITUS: TWO NOTES ON ANCIENT BOOK TITLES

1. Herodotus. Textbooks and manuals commonly assert, with varying degrees of approval or contempt, that the division of Herodotus' history into nine books subtitled by the names of the Muses was the notion of some Alexandrian scholar. Bury [1], for easy instance, opined that "the Alexandrian editor who was responsible for it was a man of extraordinary insight. His distribution perfectly exhibits the construction of the book and could not be improved by any change". By flagrant contrast, the revised *Oxford Classical Dictionary* scornfully asserts that "the clumsy division of the work into nine Muses is some librarian's fancy".

Hence the dearth of evidence for any of this comes as something of a shock. No Alexandrian or Pergamene editor is credited with this division in Pfeiffer's classic account [2] of ancient scholarship. Indeed, to judge from Pfeiffer (himself nowhere discussing the present matter), such fancies were not typical of Hellenistic scholarship: at any rate, he offers no examples. The procedures of Aristarchus, apparently the first scholar to work on prose writers, can be glimpsed from the fragmentary P. Amherst , no. 12 [3], in which the end of Herodotus' first book is subscribed Ἀριστάρχου Ἡροδότου α ὑπόμνημα [4]. This shows a division by numbers [5], but one that is not necessarily Aristarchean. It should not be forgotten that Aris-

[1] *Ancient Greek Historians*, repr. New York 1958, 38.

[2] R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford 1968 — hereinafter referred to by author's name.

[3] Ed. Grenfell-Hunt, London 1901.

[4] Cf. E. Turner, *Greek Papyri*, Oxford 1968, 113, 121, 185.

[5] There is no sign of the Muses, which implies nothing, since a subtitle need not be mentioned in the subscription to a volume's end.

tarchus' business was with the *language* of Herodotus, not the arrangment of his books. There is no warrant for some modern assertions that he made an edition of the text [6].

Naturally, it proves nothing that the subtitling by Muses is maintained in Photius [7] and the *Suda* [8], not to mention the anonymous and undatable epigram *AP* 9, 160. All of these suggest that the subtitling was conferred upon Herodotus. By contrast, the early Byzantine poet Christodorus (*AP* 2, 377-381) has the historian himself dedicate (ἀνεθήκατο) his work to the Muses. Moving further back in time, we encounter the historian Cephalion who in the reign of Hadrian composed a history in Ionic in nine books divided by Muses [9]. Cephalion clearly will have believed that he was evoking Herodotus himself, not some shadowy Alexandrian.

And indeed, it is around Cephalion's time that we find the fullest ancient source. Lucian twice (*De hist. conscr.* 42; *Herod.* 2) says that Herodotus' work was thus arranged. Interestingly, in the first of these passages, a sober discussion of historiography, there is a note of criticism of the subtitling, whereas in the purely sophistic *Herodotus* it is simply one more thing redounding to the historian's credit.

According to Jacoby [10], the historical works of the fifth century were neither numbered nor titled. All the more reason, then, for an unofficial subtitle, as either a tribute to Herodotus or as a convenience for his readers. Jacoby himself, albeit repeating the standard wisdom about Alexandrian editing of Herodotus, was prepared to consider that Hellanicus at least might himself have given titles to his own work. If Hellanicus, why not Herodotus, or else a contemporary admirer? After all, there was formal Greek scholarship by the later fifth century, before the Alexandrians [11]. A subtitling after the Muses would not only be an obvious tribute to Herodotus' poetic style and romantic content [12], it would also conform to at least

[6] Cf. Pfeiffer 225, no. 3, against Jacoby, *R.E.* Suppl. 2, col. 515.
[7] *Bibl.* cod. 60.
[8] H 563 (Adler).
[9] *Suda* K 1449; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 93.
[10] F. Jacoby, *Atthis*, repr. New York 1973, 82.
[11] Cf. Pfeiffer 25-56.
[12] Thus Christodorus, who writes exclusively in clichés, called Herodotus "the divine nightingale".

two other contemporary or near contemporary titles, the *Mousika* of Democritus and the *Mouseion* of Alcidamas [13].

2. Tacitus. "The titles Histories and Annals have no ancient authority". Thus (taking one of many possible cases) Goodyear [14], in a typical formulation of the matter, invoking (which, again, is typical) the classic study by R. P. Oliver [15]. For all this, a further consideration may be more than *crambe repetita*.

In combatting the incidental view of Jacoby [16] that Tacitus himself used the title *Annales*, Syme [17] applied what he calls a negative test: Tacitus nowhere employs *historia* or *historiae* in the sense of history. True enough, albeit one might notice the unique appearance in Tacitus of the term at *Dial.* 3, 4: *nostras quoque historias et Romana nomina* (in the context of Maternus' tragedies). Yet this need not enforce the conclusion that Tacitus' only word for history was *annales*. Employment of that noun is in his major works restricted to the Annals [18]. As will be seen, this may support a firm distinction between titles.

The statement of Jerome (*Comm. ad Zach.* 3, 14) that *Cornelius Tacitus qui post Augustum usque ad mortem Domitiani vitas Caesarum triginta voluminibus exaravit*, along with the consecutive numberings on show in the Second Medicean MS, has been taken as proof of a collected edition of the major works of Tacitus. Of these two evidences, the second is more cogent; Jerome's remark by itself could be taken as nothing more than an *informal* description of the historian's total output.

How far back such a collected edition went is impossible to ascertain. Few, these days, would dare [19] invoke the copying in bulk of the historian's works ordered by the emperor Tacitus, as alleged

[13] For these titles, cf. Pfeiffer 42, 50.

[14] F. D. R. Goodyear, *Tacitus* (*Greece a. Rome* New Series in the Classics, No. 4), Oxford 1970, 17 n. 1; cf. the fuller discussion in the first volume of his edition of the *Annals*, Cambridge 1972, 85-88.

[15] 'The First Medicean MS of Tacitus and the Titulature of Ancient Books', *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.* 82, 1951, 232-261.

[16] *Atthis* 86-87.

[17] *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958, 253.

[18] Assuming the reliability of the statistics furnished by the *Lexicon Taciteum* of Gerber-Greef-John; elsewhere at *Dial.* 22, 5; *Germ.* 2, 3.

[19] Though Oliver, *art. cit.* 261, did, in defiance of E. Hohl, 'Über den

by the *Historia Augusta* (*Tac.* 10, 3). Tertullian (*Apol.* 16; cf. *Ad nat.* 11) alludes to a passage in our Histories in the words *Cornelius Tacitus in quinta historiarum suarum*, a mode of reference surely implying a title. As to Pliny's use of *historia* in his letter (*Ep.* 7, 33) to Tacitus, Goodyear very reasonably says that he may not necessarily be referring to the title. Yet it remains suggestive that he here (also in *Ep.* 6, 16) employs the term in what are definite mentions of our Histories: he could presumably have used another one.

In taking the Histories and Annals back to Tacitus himself, what we need is a good reason for thus distinguishing between the titles. Goodyear points the right way in directing attention to Servius on *Aen.* 1, 373. That commentator offers the following doctrine: *inter historiam et annales hoc interest: historia est eorum temporum quae vel vidimus vel videre potuimus, dicta* ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, *id est, videre; annales vero sunt eorum annorum quos aetas nostra non novit.* This notion can also be read in Isidore, *Orig.* 1, 44-45. Its co-existence with the apparent collected edition of Tacitus' works is of blatant interest.

The wisdom of Servius seems ultimately derived [20] from Aulus Gellius who (*NA* 5, 18) quotes Sempronius Asellio to the effect that *historiam ab annalibus quidam differre eo putant quod, cum utrumque sit rerum gestarum narratio, earum tamen proprie rerum sit historia quibus rebus gerendis interfuerit is qui narret.* Such a demarcation would suit Tacitus. The *Historiae* begin in the year 69, at which time he was entering upon manhood or at least leaving childhood [21]; they encompass the period in which the historian, as he is quick to point out (1, 1), not only lived but advanced his career.

Gellius nowhere mentions the name of Cornelius Tacitus. Nevertheless, it is a possibility that his discussion was inspired by the recent appearance of that historian's two major works, something that may have prompted students then as now to ask the reason for such distinction of title between narratives so seemingly similar.

Ursprung der Historia Augusta', *Hermes* 55, 1920, 300; and Goodyear in his Commentary (87) mentions the possibility without disdain.

[20] Not noted by Goodyear.

[21] Assuming a birthdate around 55; cf. Syme, *Tacitus* 63.

III

CLEON'S STRATEGY AT AMPHIPOLIS

This is a much discussed topic, of course, and another article on the subject needs a word of defence.[1] Despite the efforts of Grote[2] and Woodhead,[3] the Thucydidean picture of Cleon still dominates modern accounts.[4] It is a picture I am not disposed to accept. Rather than repeat the standard accounts of the role of Cleon in the Pylos episode, I propose to examine in depth Thucydides' military narrative concerning Cleon at Amphipolis. The historian's interest in Amphipolis is well known. I shall contend that his treatment of Cleon's activities, culminating in the latter's defeat and death, is deliberately inadequate, confused, and distorted to the point of dishonesty. My concern is not with Cleon the politician, but with Cleon the general and Thucydides as military historian.

Prior to the actual engagement, Cleon conducted a series of raids against cities of the Thracian area. Since the researches of West and Meritt,[5] modern commentators are coming to suspect Thucydides of suppressing Cleon's real achievements in this area.[6] Apart from his sins of omission, Thucydides minimises the Athenian achievement in capturing Torone. Cleon's men forced the defensive wall against the opposition of Pasitelidas' soldiers and the inhabitants of the city (5.3.1.). Gomme[7] is not unfair in pointing out that the fortifications in question were in a state of dilapidation; Thucydides' narrative indicates that the old wall had been partly dismantled and the new defence works were incomplete. Yet the capture of a city by storm was a remarkable achievement at this stage of Greek warfare. According to Adcock,[8] there is no certain record of Greeks successfully storming a Greek city until the first phase of the Peloponnesian War. Cleon's capture compares very favourably with the earlier capture by Brasidas, since the latter had the advantage

1. Much of my treatment follows the *Commentary* of A. W. Gomme (Oxford, 1956), pp. 631—654; see also his article in *Hellenika* XIII (1954), pp. 1—10. My debt to Gomme is obvious, but I find some of his efforts to justify Thucydides' account of Cleon unconvincing and, at times, verging on desperation.

2. G. Grote, *History of Greece*, Vol. V (London Edition, 1906), pp. 392—393.

3. A. G. Woodhead, 'Thucydides' Portrait of Cleon', *Mnemosyne* (1960), pp. 289—317.

4. There is no need to multiply references. I cite, for examples: F. M. Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London Edition, 1965); J. H. Finley, Jr., *Thucydides* (Ann Arbor Edition, 1963); F. E. Adcock, *Thucydides and his History* (Cambridge, 1963).

5. West-Meritt, 'Cleon's Amphipolitan Campaign and the Assessment List of 422—421', *A.J.A.* XXIX (1925), pp. 54—69.

6. Gomme, *op cit.*, p. 636; J. De Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism* (English Edition, Oxford, 1963), p. 192 n.2.

7. *op cit.*, p. 631.

8. F. E. Adcock, *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (Berkeley, 1962), pp. 56—58.

of allies within the city who opened the gates to him.[9] Cleon's next achievement, the capture of Galepsos, was no mean feat (5 6.1); this Thasian colony had gone over to Brasidas,[10] and its situation on a hill[11] serves to heighten Cleon's achievement in storming it. Thucydides allows the success no more space than the failure to take Stagiros.[12]

After Galepsos, Cleon settled down in Eion, to await the reinforcements he had requested from Perdiccas, and from the Odomantian king Polles (5.6.2). Aware of this, Brasidas took up a defensive position on Cerdylium,[13] from where he could observe the Athenian movements.

It is at this point that the Thucydidean account begins to strain credulity. Brasidas is represented as assuming that Cleon would attack Amphipolis with the troops that he had with him, because he would be contemptuous of Brasidas' numbers.[14] This is absurd. Brasidas' forces are immediately detailed by the historian: 1,500 Thracian mercenaries; all the Edonian peltasts and cavalry; 1,000 Myrcinian and Chalcidian peltasts along with those in Amphipolis; 2,000 hoplites; 300 Hellenic cavalry. Of the aforementioned, Brasidas retained 1,500 on Cerdylium; the rest were held, under Clearidas, in Amphipolis.[15]

Hardly a force to be scorned. Cleon, by contrast, had begun his operations with 1,200 hoplites, 300 Athenian cavalry, and an unspecified 'larger number' of allied soldiers (5.2.1). Thucydides gives no casualty figures for the engagements at Torone, Stagiros and Galepsos, but we must surely assume some Athenian losses, especially in view of the nature of the fighting. The Athenian forces are later described as first class troops, supported by the best of the Lemnians and Imbrians.[16] However, from Thucydides' own statistics, it is manifest how much Cleon needed his reinforcements (5.6.2). If Cleon had any proper idea of Brasidas' numbers,[17] it is inconceivable that he would scorn the opposition. A huge numerical superiority on Pylos had not encouraged the Athenians to decisive action! Moreover, Thucydides is soon to reveal that the forces

9. Thucydides IV, 110—112. All subsequent footnote references to Thucydides are given without the author's name.

10. IV. 107. 3.

11. For the site of Galepsos, see Gomme, p. 580.

12. N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Greece* (Oxford, 1959), p. 374, wrongly states that Cleon captured Stagiros.

13. See Gomme, p. 636, for the topography.

14. V. 6. 3.

15. V. 6. 5.

16. V. 8. 2. See Gomme, *ad loc.*, for the difficulties of the Greek.

17. Cleon is supposed to have been heartened by the fact that no defenders were visible in Amphipolis when he advanced, and is represented as lamenting his failure to bring siege engines against a 'deserted city' (V. 7. 5.). This is mere rhetoric on the historian's part. Later, when Brasidas had come down from Cerdylium, Cleon was close enough to see the feet of horses and men (V. 10. 2.). But this comes after his initial 'scorn'.

of Cleon and Brasidas were about equal in number.[18] And if Cleon did not know the strength of the enemy, how could he have scorned an unknown quantity? Whatever character defects Cleon may have had, risking his own life was never one of them; Thucydides is quite clear on this, in his account of the Cleon-Nicias debate over the Pylos command!

The narrative worsens. In wishing to wait for his reinforcements, Cleon was doing precisely what Brasidas was not expecting him to do. In other words, Cleon was demonstrating that he was not a fool in military matters. The malice of the Thucydidean portrait of the generals' psychologies is exposed by his own recital of the facts. At length Cleon moves. But not from his own choice; he is said to be forced to this by the unrest amongst his own men. If we concede the truth of this, it does not square with the historian's description of Cleon, used to introduce him into the *History* in the context of the debate with Diodotos, as the 'most persuasive' of men.[19]

Brasidas now came down from Cerdylium to Amphipolis. He is said, remarkably, to distrust the quality of his own troops (5.8.2). No reason for this disquiet is offered by the historian. It does not prevent him from treating his men to a speech on their own merits and valour! He selected a chosen band of 150 hoplites;[20] the rest were entrusted to Clearidas.

When Cleon realized that Brasidas was going to attack, he ordered an immediate retreat. His reason is the expected one; he wanted to wait for his reinforcements to arrive (5.10.3). In view of Thucydides' own statistics regarding the numbers on both sides, Cleon's decision is hard to fault. He ordered the left line southwards towards Eion, a manoeuvre said by Thucydides to be 'the only possible one'.[21] He himself headed the right wing, wheeling it round so that it exposed its unarmed side to the enemy. Then came the attack, first by Brasidas and his contingent, in which clash the Athenian centre was broken; Clearidas now charges out, to take the Athenians on the other side. The left wing fled; the right wing offered more resistance. Here, of course, we have the notorious claim that Cleon fled at once, having no intention of standing his ground. Even Gomme is reluctant to accept this masterstroke of Thucydidean bias.[22] Adcock's defence of the historian's claim is quite remarkable.[23] Suffice

18. V. 8. 2.

19. III. 36. 6. Thucydides' artistry is not at its most convincing, since this most persuasive man is immediately defeated in debate by Diodotos! And, on his next celebrated appearance in debate, he is worsted by Nicias, whom Plutarch (*Nicias* 2) describes as notoriously nervous in public.

20. This figure is suspected, rightly, by Gomme, p. 643.

21. V. 10. 3. For Cleon's signal, see J. K. Anderson, Cleon's Orders at Amphipolis, *J. H. S.* LXXXV (1965), pp. 1—4.

22. p. 652.

23. *Thucydides and his History*, p. 63. Adcock maintains that Cleon did run away, for only in this way would he have been killed by a peltast in normal conditions of battle. But is there any validity in such a concept of 'normality'? I think not, especially in the situation of the Athenians' retreat.

it to say that Thucydides is not believed by Diodorus, which proves nothing but is surely significant of something;[24] as Woodhead observes,[25] Thucydides could not possibly have had any proper evidence for his claim; the allegation is contrary to the entire narrative of the campaign. It cannot be reconciled with the Cleon who stormed Torone and Galepsos, who was as confident in this last engagement as he had been at Pylos,[26] who was scornful of the opposition, and who took personal command of the retreat of the right wing rather than get away first with the left.

To conclude. Cleon's entire campaign was fruitful, and was conducted competently. He took two cities by storm, a rare achievement for his day. He was right to try to await his requested reinforcements before trying conclusions with Brasidas. He had no numerical superiority, and no grounds for supposing that he had. He did not blunder at once into doing what Brasidas hoped he would. It is fair to criticize him for deferring to the rashness of his troops, but this does not destroy his general reputation, and is out of tune with the contrived Thucydidean picture of the violent and persuasive demagogue. His personal courage is not seriously in question. One may deplore Cleon's political career; one might minimize his Pylos triumph as a piece of luck, combined with the presence of Demosthenes. But Thucydides' own narrative refutes his intended impression of the incompetent coward. Certainly, the *sophrones* who, before Pylos, had allegedly hoped for his death,[27] are impressively silent after the battle of Amphipolis!

IV

NOTES ON HYPERBOLUS

Thucydides (8.73.3) has one contemptuous reference to the unfortunate seller of lamps. Hyperbolus was a worthless character (μοχθηρός), whom no one really feared; he was ostracised for his depravity (διὰ πονηρίαν), and murdered on Samos in 411.

His language is evocative. The epithet μοχθηρός occurs only here in the historian;[2] along with the phrase διά πονηρίαν, it derives from Aristophanes.[3] The entire statement is less illuminating than the much-maligned merchandise of the victim. Hyperbolus is introduced out of political and chronological context, to be killed off like a minor Homeric hero with a gleeful *ave atque vale*. The details of his career and influence are discreetly omitted; the alleged reason for his ostracism is absurd, and the tradition that he was the last victim of this fate is absent; no precise motive for the subsequent liquidation of such a worthless cypher is offered.

The scornful silence is incongruous by the side of Old Comedy's vigorous attention to the demagogue. Hermippus supposedly set the fashion of abusing him, and both Plato and Eupolis consecrated specific plays to the popular butt. Other comedians, such as Cratinus, Leucon, and Polyzelus joined the hunt.[4] Aristophanes himself alludes to Hyperbolus in seven plays, ranging chronologically from 425 to 405.[5]

Thucydides' *suppressio veri* perhaps influenced the author of the *Athenaion Politeia*, who obliterates Hyperbolus from his accounts of ostracism and register of corrupt demagogues. Nevertheless, the demagogue is an immoral

---

1. I am indebted to my colleague Dr. M. V. Molitor for his assistance with the prosopography of Old Comedy. Readers are warned (or consoled) that this article eschews the question of dating Hyperbolus' ostracism.

2. The point is noted by H. D. Westlake, *Individuals in Thucydides* (1968), 13; confirmed by Bétant, *Lexicon Thucydideum*.

3. The epithet is not otherwise applied to demagogues by Aristophanes. The noun πονηρία occurs only here and at *Thes.* 868. Hyperbolus is πονηρὸν προστάτην at *Pax* 684. See the statistics of O. J. Todd, *Index Aristophaneus* (1932).

4. Cratinus 196,262; Eupolis 190,192,193,194,238; Plato 167,168, 169,170,187; Leucon 1; Polyzelus 5. All references are to J. M. Edmonds, *Fragments of Attic Comedy* (1957), vol. 1. See Aristophanes, *Nubes* 557 for Hermippus as the instigator of the attacks. His chief onslaught was apparently in the *Artopolides*. If anything may be inferred from titles, Plato's *Hyperbolus* was the most directly political satire.

5. *Ach.* 846; *Eq.* 1304,1363; *Nubes* 551,557–8,623,876,1065; *Vespae* 1007; *Pax* 681,921, 1319; *Thes.* 840; *Ranae* 570. These references are restricted to actual mentions of Hyperbolus. There are many other possible allusions in the comedians.

stereotype as early as Isocrates.[6] He had, of course, been the victim of abusive attacks from Andocides.[7] The comic evidence was developed with relish by Theopompus, whose account is the chief acknowledged source for the relevant scholia to Aristophanes and Lucian.[8] Theopompus is remarkable for his assertion that Hyperbolus was the son of Chremes, rather than Antiphanes, and for his piquant details on the treatment of the demagogue's corpse.[9]

Plutarch was fascinated enough to tell the story of the ostracism three times.[10] Whether he used Theopompus is a moot point.[11] He cites comedians such as Plato by name, was influenced by the Phaeax speech of *pseudo-Andocides 4*, and cites both Theophrastus and other unnamed sources for variant details on the factions combined against Hyperbolus.[12]

Later antiquity heard much but knew little of Hyperbolus. He is a traditional villain in authors so diverse as Quintilian, Lucian, and Aelian.[13] The stories grew to the point where a scholiast could assert that Hyperbolus had been a general,[14] and Himerius could imagine a prosecution by the demagogue of Nicias.[15]

An identikit picture can be cautiously assembled from the comedians. We assume the usual proviso: the difficulty of distinguishing slander from veracity. The standard jokes flew thick and fast. Hyperbolus was of low or

---

6. *De Pace* 75; Hyperbolus is coupled with Cleophon.

7. Fr. 5 (Blass); Hyperbolus is the foreign lamp seller son of a branded slave at the mint. The orator was clearly drawing upon the repertoire of the comedians.

8. See the scholia on Lucian, *Timon* 30; Aristophanes, *Vespae* 1007, *Pax* 681. The passages are assembled by W. R. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens* (1968), 59–63.

9. The confusion of fathers may have arisen out of the standard jokes against Hyperbolus' low and foreign birth; it is likely that the demagogue was accused of illegitimacy also. Alternatively, Theopompus may have confused the demagogue with one of the other attested Hyperbolus'. The cadaver of Hyperbolus was forced into a bag or wine skin, and flung into the sea. The wine skin may derive from the comedians' jokes on Hyperbolus' luxurious living. For Theopompus and *katapontismos*, see Connor, 61.

10. *Aristides* 7; *Nicias* 11; *Alcibiades* 13.

11. See A. E. Raubitschek, 'Theopompus on Hyperbolus', *Phoenix* 9 (1955), 122–26. Plutarch probably combined his sources like the scholium on *Pax* 681, which follows Theopompus on Hyperbolus' paternity and then ends by virtually quoting Thucydides on the ostracism. See Connor, 62–3.

12. Theophrastus is cited at *Nicias* 11, the unspecified accounts at *Alcibiades* 13. The Phaeax speech (probably either a forgery or a rhetorical exercise) and Plato are cited at *Alcibiades* 13, and Plato again at *Nicias* 11. Thucydides is named at *Alcibiades* 13, although the epithet used is πονηρός, not μοχθηρός.

13. Quintilian 1.10.18; Lucian, *Timon* 30 (Hyperbolus coupled with Cleon); Aelian, *VH* 12.43.

14. Schol. *ad* Ar. *Ach.* 846.

15. *Ecl.* 36.318; see Edmonds, 599.

foreign birth; his mother was drunken and corrupt, and he had had to follow a humble profession.[16]

Hyperbolus made an early entry into politics. The point was urged against him by both Cratinus and Eupolis.[17] He was prominent enough to be attacked by Aristophanes (*Ach.* 846–7) in a general passage on sycophants. Hyperbolus is named along with the perennial Cleonymus and a certain Prepis. This latter is described by the scholiast as a sodomite, but may have had another fundamental distinction. A Prepis is attested as γραμματεὺς βουλῆς for 421/20. The name is not common, and equation of Aristophanes' butt with the official is reasonable.[18] Hyperbolus' status as a βουλευτής can be inferred from *Nubes* 680–92 and from Plato (fr. 167). Perhaps he was building a discernible faction in the 420s. His sycophancy, along with his mother's ill-gotten gains, will have helped him to the luxurious living for which Plato attacks him (fr. 169). It may also be significant that Hermippus made him a popular target, when this comedian's alleged earlier role in the prosecution of Aspasia is recalled.[19]

Hyperbolus was represented as a poor man's Cleon. The lamp seller was probably beginning to rival the tanner's influence before the latter's death. *Equites* 1304 asserts that Hyperbolus was planning an expedition against Carthage. An earlier reference in the play (174) suggests that this was a scheme of Cleon, and the charge was perhaps repeated against the latter in the *Centaur*.[20] It will be seen later that this matter may supply an early clue to Hyperbolus' eventual ostracism.

Cleon's death opened the path to influence. Aristophanes desperately alleged (*Pax* 685–7) that the people merely used the demagogue as a cat's-paw. The expedient was a convenient explanation for Plutarch who reproduced it.[21] An obscure passage (*Nubes* 623–5) refers to some chicanery whereby Hyperbolus was appointed on a mission to the Amphictyonic Council and then deprived of his position. The libel is comparable to Plato's doubts about the legality of the demagogue's election to the council (fr. 166). A second instructive passage in the *Nubes* (1065–6) parades Hyperbolus as a pupil of the Unjust Cause; the passage provides Thucydides with his phrase διὰ πονηρίαν.

---

16. Hyperbolus is a Lydian (Plato 170) or a Phrygian (Polyzelus 5), who spoke bad Greek (Plato 168). The point is underlined by Eupolis' title *Maricas*. The bibulous mother was the target of Hermippus' *Artopolides*; she occurs inevitably in Aristophanes (*Nubes* 551, *Thes.* 840) as rich and corrupt. Leucon (fr. 1) imputes theft to Hyperbolus. The lamp seller motif is widespread.

17. Cratinus 262; Eupolis 238.

18. Tentatively proposed by J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (1903), vol. 2,227 (*s.v. Prepis*).

19. Plutarch, *Pericles* 32.

20. This is inferred from the pun on *byrsa* and Byrsa; see Edmonds, 655.

21. *Alcibiades* 13.

The versatile Hyperbolus may also have been a trierarch. Aristophanes (Thes. 836–7) ridicules cowardly sailors and vile trierarchs. Hyperbolus is not named, but the passage is in the context of the odious influence of his mother. Cleophon is named in this choral parabasis, as is Charminus who connived at Hyperbolus' death on Samos. These collocations may be significant. A military career can hardly be worked out, or even presumed, but some sort of naval or army exploits seem to have been ridiculed by Eupolis.[22]

The man deserved the fate, the fate did not deserve the man. That was the pretty comment of Plato (fr. 187) on Hyperbolus' ostracism. But why was he ostracised? Thucydides' 'reason' is proposterous, and was too much for even Plutarch to swallow.[23] No sober man could credit Alcibiades (of all people) with arranging an ostracism διὰ πονηρίαν. The explanation may go back to the 420s and Aristophanes' claim that Hyperbolus was planning an expedition against Carthage. Carthaginian aspirations are associated with Alcibiades in the period of the Sicilian expedition. Thucydides directly imputes (6.15.2), and Alcibiades claims them in his speech at Sparta (6.90.2). Alcibiades may of course have exaggerated his ambitions in order to terrify the Spartans into action, and Carthage is not an overt issue in the debate between himself and Nicias prior to the Sicilian venture.[24] However, if Hyperbolus was associated with the scheme, whether it was his own idea or inherited from Cleon, a good reason for the ostracism is provided. Alcibiades may have reasoned that, with Hyperbolus out of the way, he could appropriate the Carthaginian policy and present it as his own at the first suitable occasion. The same notion may also have occurred to the new demagogue on the scene, Androcles. It is notable that Aristophanes applied the epithet μοχθηρός to Hyperbolus in this Carthaginian allusion. It is possible that Thucydides took it over because of a mental connection between demagogues and Carthaginian schemes.

Phaeax is relevant to the matter. He was prominent enough to be ridiculed for his oratory (*Eq.* 1375–81). Plutarch, wrestling with the comic evidence and Thucydides' silence, quotes a similar joke from Eupolis.[25] The biographer was aware of accounts which stated that Alcibiades had arranged his anti-Hyperbolus pact with Phaeax, not Nicias.[26] Phaeax had been on a diplomatic mission to Italy and Sicily (Thucydides 5.4.1). The experience may have persuaded him into strong views, for or against, on a Carthaginian

22. Fr. 192; Maricas is dubbed as περσέπτολις, in a parody of Aeschylus, *Persae* 65.

23. Plutarch follows Thucydides at *Nicias* 11, but *Alcibiades* 13 stresses the real influence of the demagogue; *Aristides* 7 is equivocal.

24. See M. F. McGregor, 'The Genius of Alkibiades', *Phoenix* 19 (1965), 27–46.

25. Eupolis 91, cited at *Alcibiades* 13. Eupolis 7 has a joke on Phaeax' gastronomy.

26. Plutarch is neutral on the matter at *Alcibiades* 13, but implicitly rejects the version at *Nicias* 11.

policy. If he was for the scheme, he would be a potential threat to Alcibiades' influence, and Plutarch would be correct in placing him with Nicias as a leading rival. If he was opposed, then his agreement to turn the ostracism against Hyperbolus was natural and even principled.

We know who killed Cock Robin, but why? Thucydides associated the general Charminus with Hyperbolus' murder. Charminus had been sent to Samos (8.30.1), and had been defeated in a sea battle by the Spartans off Syme (8.41–2). It has been noticed that he appears in a significant passage in the *Thesmophoriazusae*. The context is notable, if only as a coincidence. Charminus is postluded by an abrasive reference to Cleophon, and the choral passage builds up to the above-mentioned comments on Hyperbolus' mother. Charminus may have been an old enemy of Hyperbolus, or the two may have clashed recently on Samos. Perhaps Charminus connived at the murder in the hope of future ingratiation with Alcibiades, or with the oligarchs at Athens.

Whatever the date of his ostracism, Hyperbolus had enjoyed a lengthy and various career. He had been a comic target for nearly a decade. The jokes of the stage left their mark on Thucydides, whose statement on Hyperbolus is not more than a patchwork of phrases from Aristophanes. The subsequent, pious tradition that ostracism was abandoned because of the disgrace of using it against such a villain is impossible to accept. The notion, clearly based on the epigram of Plato, presupposes an incredible bout of collective and enduring disgust on the part of the Athenians. The immediate reason for the disappearance of the institution was the changed nature of politics and factions. After the eclipse of Hyperbolus, old enemies die or fade away. Nicias perished on Sicily. Alcibiades was exiled, returned, and again withdrew. Androcles was murdered, and Cleophon eventually executed. The atmosphere at Athens during the last years of the war militated against ostracism. There were no spectacular personal feuds, and popular resentments were expressed in different ways; as, for example, the trial of the generals after Arginusae. It is more than a coincidence that the attested use and abuse of the *graphe paranomon* may date from c. 415,[27] thereby replacing ostracism as a political weapon.

Precise details of Hyperbolus' career cannot be rescued. For nearly a decade he was an important element in Athenian politics. His attitudes and policies were influenced by Cleon. That was reason enough for the comedians' abuse and the distortion of Thucydides. I am no scholiast, and shall not invent details of a personal issue between the demagogue and the historian. The standard jokes establish him as typical of the breed of popular politician after Pericles. Old Comedy, incidentally, did not draw the same fine distinction between Pericles and his successors, as do Thucydides and

27. See C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (1952), 210–13.

too many scholars. It was natural that Hyperbolus should be an enemy of Nicias. In other circumstances, however, he might have been used rather than abused by Alcibiades. To the latter, Hyperbolus was the wrong man with the right ideas. The seller of lamps had to be extinguished. He was; in terms of career, life, and reputation.

V

NOTES ON CLEOPHON

He used to be the maker of lyres, born of unknown father and Thracian mother, the most baneful demagogue in Athens during the fateful period 411–404, the corrupt blusterer who constantly impeded peace until it was too late, finally liquidated on the ironic charge of evading military service.

The picture is changing. Ostraca found in recent years have furnished Cleophon with a distinguished father, a suspect brother, and a political career extending back to the ostracism of Hyperbolus and the heady years of the Sicilian expedition.[1]

Provocative discoveries, at first blush. For Cleophon does not appear in Thucydides, and the extant references of Aristophanes and the other comedians apply only to 411 and subsequent years. Allusions in Xenophon, Aristotle, and the orators conform to the same pattern.

Reflection tempers surprise. Few scholars are now disposed to swallow the libels of the comedians on the demagogues.[2] More to the point, the omissions and distorted comments of Thucydides on this topic are equally suspect. Hence the general burden of this paper's argument is not intrepidly novel.

However, the fullest collections of *testimonia* on Cleophon were assembled long before the ostraca discoveries.[3] The literary evidences are jejune at best, inconsistent and fraught with political bias at worst. Lack of analysis has caused superficial and inaccurate accounts of Cleophon to be enshrined in the textbooks, especially on the matter of his execution. And the epochal study of demagogues by Connor,[4] although furnishing valuable references and observations, eschews a full survey of Cleophon's career. This paper, then, is offered as a modest supplement to current knowledge and opinion; and, with less humility, as a new companion to my own earlier considerations of Cleon and Hyperbolus.[5]

---

1. See E. Vanderpool, *Hesperia* 21 (1952), 114–5; *Hesperia* 37 (1968), 120; *Ostracism at Athens* (1970), 27–8; A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesperia* 23 (1954), 68–71; R. Meiggs & D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (1969), 41–2.

2. See M. I. Finley's influential 'Athenian Demagogues', *Past & Present* 21 (1962), 3–24. For the subject in Cleophon's context, see G. M. E. de St. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (1972), 235 n.7, 360 n.5, 371, 373.

3. Apart from Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica* (henceforth cited as *PA*), 8638, see H. A. Holden, *Onomasticon Aristophaneum* (1902), s.v. *Kleophon*, though his references tend to be inaccurate. There is also Swoboda's article in *PW* XI, cols. 792–6.

4. W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens* (1971), 83 n.82, 139, 143, 145, 153, 158, 169.

5. *Acta Classica* 11 (1968), 211–14 (Cleon); *Acta Classica* 14 (1971), 151–6 (Hyperbolus).

First, Aristophanes. His earliest extant allusion is in *Thesmophoriazusae* 805; it is in the parabasis, which ought to be significant. Both context and phraseology are compelling. Just as Charminos is inferior to Nausimache in the preceding line, so Cleophon is dubbed as very much worse than Salabakcho. The scholiast predictably regarded both ladies as whores, which could of course be correct, and opines that Cleophon the lyre-maker is here branded as a *cinaedus*.

There is much more to it than that. The obvious foreignness of the name Salabakcho is employed in this copulative nomenclature to reflect the usual allegations against Cleophon of low or alien parentage on his mother's side. Hyperbolus suffers the same attacks. So does Cleon, which is immediately pertinent. For in *Equites* 765, Cleon is made to describe himself as the best person in Athens after Lysicles, Cynna, and Salabakcho. Lysicles is that tantalisingly obscure demagogue from the early years of the Peloponnesian War who is said to have married Aspasia after the death of Pericles. Cynna, according to the scholiast (who indulges himself in scholarly rebuttal of the interpretation of Eratosthenes), was another harlot. Her flashing eyes are twice mentioned by Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 1032; *Pax* 755: a one-line description, identical in both plays).

The combination of demagogues with suggestively-named women of low repute is a stock motif of comedy, and nothing is proved against Cleophon's character. But literary motifs can also be political commonplaces. The introduction of Cleophon in the *Thesmophoriazusae* is made in the immediate context of Charminos. This latter is the general who was sent to Samos, and who was defeated by the Spartans in a sea battle off Syme. Hence his association with Nausimache is punningly appropriate, perhaps suspiciously so. But the literary blends with the political when it is recollected that Charminos is associated by Thucydides with the murder of Hyperbolus on Samos.[6] Add the fact that the parabasis under discussion builds up to an abrasive attack on the mother of Hyperbolus, and we are getting somewhere. Cleophon is adduced as a name as familiar to the audience as notorieties such as Charminos and Hyperbolus. Further, he is deemed worthy of the exact insult once levelled against Cleon. Cleophon is not a new figure on the political scene in 411.

That conclusion will need more investigation, as will the wider issues thus raised. These will all be reverted to, later on. The other play of Aristophanes in which Cleophon features is the *Ranae*. There are three overt allusions. The first (679) occurs in the opening of the parabasis. Cleophon is adduced as a name synonymous with ambition, and there is mockery (somewhat obscured by textual problems in 682/3) of his supposedly Thracian connections. In the second passage (1504), Aeschylus is urged to save Athens from the many fools and rogues infesting the city, including Cleophon. The final reference (1532) is

6. Thuc. 8. 30; 41–2; see my Hyperbolus article on all this, and *PA* 15517 for Charminos.

in the very last sentence in the play. The chorus urges peace and advises Cleophon and other 'foreigners' to depart and fight at home.

The allusion to Cleophon's ambition was to become a proverbial tag in later antiquity; a similar phenomenon is discernible in the cases of Hyperbolus, Peisander, and others.[7] Cleophon's own case is cited by the scholiast on *Ranae* 1532. Thus another literary-political cliché is established. No further comment on Thracian origins is needed, for the moment. The scholiast on *Ranae* 679 claims, without furnishing (or fabricating) details, that Cleophon was a general. This is a fascinating possibility in several regards, especially in the light of his newly-discovered father's career and his own execution; it is not confirmed elsewhere, and is not unique to Cleophon. Cleon was a general; Hyperbolus may have been general or trierarch; Lysicles and Eucrates are other candidates for the role of demagogue-general.[8]

The second passage links Cleophon with the *Poristae* named Myrmex, Nicomachus, and Archenomos, although the scholiast separates the first two names from the *Poristae* and claims that they are simply being attacked for their vileness. The copulation of Cleophon and financial officials can be connected to the demagogue's association with the controversial *diobelia*. However, one cannot help thinking also of the alleged son of Lysicles and Aspasia, called Poristes.[9]

The fact that Cleophon is brought back to round off the *Ranae* as the only named warmonger is both a tribute to his eminence in Athenian politics in the last stages of the war, and an explanation as to why it was his removal that was most desired by the oligarchs.

Apart from Aristophanes, the major name in comedy in the context of our demagogue is Plato, who wrote a play entitled *Cleophon*. This is presumably another tribute to Cleophon's ascendancy, though it may equally reflect only that playwright's hostility to the politico. The surviving fragments and ancient comments indicate that the basic jokes are Cleophon's cupidity, depravity, and mother.[10] No surprise there, though it will be seen that the first accusation is expressly refuted (at least in a sense) by Lysias. We know that Plato's *Cleophon* came third to the *Ranae*. It is hard to say whether this is suggestive of anything about popular opinion and Cleophon's standing. After all, the triumphant *Ranae* hits hard at the demagogue, and one remembers that Aristophanes also took first prize with the *Equites*.

Otherwise, the surviving comic fragments have no overt and little covert criticism of Cleophon. A hit at his mother has been detected in the use of

7. Connor, 139, registers examples and references.

8. For demagogues as generals, Connor, 143f.; for Lysicles, *PA* 9417; for Eucrates, *PA* 5759; for Hyperbolus, my article.

9. The evidence for this is the scholiast on Plato, *Menexenus* 235b, but the matter is under suspicion; see Gomme on Thuc. 3. 19. 1, and J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (1971), 458. The name *Poristes* is not admitted in *PA*.

10. See J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, vol. 1 (1957), 506f.

Thracian women in the *Pisces* of Archippus[11] (perhaps produced in 401), but the Thracian motif is too common to allow such precise identification of targets. The correct explanation of Archippus' scenario is given by Athenaeus, who extrapolates from his own monograph on the point and concludes that *Thratta* (=a small fish) is used for a pun.[12]

While on this subject, we may as well finally expel Thracian women from the scene. Cratinus wrote a play called *The Thracian Women* (perhaps produced in 442), in which Pericles is attacked.[13] A character in the *Prospaltians* of Eupolis (produced in 429?) has a mother who is a Thracian ribbon-seller.[14] Aristophanes was fond of the motif.[15] It was a refinement of the basic joke to claim that bad tragedians were of Thracian stock; Aristophanes uses this against Meletus.[16] So, more interestingly, does Theopompus against Acestor, who was a friend of Cleon.[17] Finally, the *Baptae* of Eupolis used the theme of the Thracian rites of Cotytto, which involved men dancing to the music of a lyre-playing girl.[18] That might suggest that the picture of Cleophon, the alleged lyre-making son of a Thracian mother, is nothing but a composite of comic motifs.

No need to linger on the matter of low-born or foreign mothers. It would be surprising if Cleophon had not been furnished with the same trappings as had been Acestor, Cleon, Euripides, Hyperbolus, and the like. Equally unsurprising is the continuance of the motif by the fourth-century orators and the later commentators. The former employ all the scurrilous techniques of comedy; the latter elevated them to the status of proverb and history.

A last word on the subject of alien birth. The theme is a consequence of Pericles' law on citizenship eligibility. In the first half of the fifth century, Cimon (for easy example) had not had to worry about his Thracian mother. In one sense, it is paradoxical that the comedians flaunt the *democratic* xenophobia of their age. Of course, this is largely explained by the simple fact that they were out to please their Athenian audiences. Reverting to Cleophon, there was the old mystery of his father: a mystery, indeed, as old as Aelian, and one shared by Hyperbolus and Demades.[19] The ostraca discoveries now appear to have provided Cleophon with a doughty father: Cleippides, son of Deinias, of Acharnae. We did not know this until a few years ago; Aelian did not know it; Aristophanes and company must have known it. Hence the paternity of Cleophon had to be played down. But there was one possible smear even here

11. Archippus 27 (Edmonds, 802).
12. *Deip.* 7. 329b.
13. Cratinus 71–83 (Edmonds, 44 f.).
14. Eupolis 243 (Edmonds, 396).
15. *Ach.* 273; *Vesp.* 828; *Pax* 1138; *Thesm.* 279, 280, 284, 293.
16. *Fr.* 438 (Edmonds, 696).
17. Theopompus 60 (Edmonds, 868); on Acestor, see Connor, 130.
18. According to the scholiast on Juvenal 2. 91–2; see Edmonds, 330.
19. Aelian, *VH* 12. 43.

which they might have used, at least implicitly: the name Deinias. For in a fragment of the *Medea* of Strattis, there is an Egyptian called Deinias, shamefully familiar with unguents.[20] This is not to impugn the credentials of Cleippides' father, but simply to show that one male name in Cleophon's family tree lent itself to ethnic jokes.

All in all, there is not really much about Cleophon in the extant plays and fragments of Aristophanes and the other comedians. The balance would obviously be redressed if Plato's play had survived. And there is the simple fact that no play by Aristophanes between the *Thesmophoriazusae* and the *Ranae*, that is, for the period of Cleophon's greatest eminence, happens to survive.

This simple point is important. Along with the misrepresentations of Thucydides, it further distorts the picture we have of the post-Periclean demagogues from the extant comic references. Had it not been for the comedians (and their scholiasts and other commentators), what would we (or, for that matter, Plutarch) know of Hyperbolus? Very little, thanks to the blatant suppression of his career and influence by Thucydides. The same is true of Lysicles, Eucrates, and the various friends and allies of Cleon. And there is the even more pertinent case of Androcles. This latter is scantily and confusingly represented in the remains of comedy.[21] Like Hyperbolus, albeit with less overt malice, he is mentioned only once by Thucydides: introduced and killed in one sentence.[22] But, again like Hyperbolus, he was deemed important enough by the revolutionary elements of 411 to be liquidated with celerity. This is very relevant to the picture of Cleophon in the sources, especially that of his ultimate fate.

One final point on the comic evidence. Cleophon is nowhere dubbed with his infamous epithet of lyre-maker. In fact, λυροποιός is not used in any (surviving) context by Aristophanes.[23] The scholiast has it, of course, but the most 'respectable' sources for the term are Andocides, Aeschines, and the *Ath. Pol.* The orators could have inherited the epithet from comedy, but it is impossible to be sure, since they were themselves so addicted to mutual exchange of such insults. It is not employed by Xenophon, which may be significant, for he was no lover of popular leaders. However, there is very little about Cleophon in the *Hellenica*; Xenophon may simply have imitated the Thucydidean technique of suppression. Nor does the term occur in Lysias. Nothing can be inferred from that, for, as will be seen later, Lysias on Cleophon is, to say the least, equivocal.

A quick word on another wretched business. References to evil leaders and foreign babblers in the *Orestes* of Euripides (772, 903f.) were taken by some

20. Strattis 33 (Edmonds, 822); see also V. Ehrenberg, *People of Aristophanes* (1951), 151.

21. For Androcles, see *PA* 870; *PW* I, col. 2148; Connor, 143, 155 n.40; D. M. MacDowell, *Andocides: On the Mysteries* (1962), 81–2, 179, 182–4, 190, 193; I hope to write elsewhere on this demagogue.

22. Thuc. 8. 65. 2.

23. According to O. J. Todd, *Index Aristophaneus* (1932).

commentators to allude to Cleophon. But the scholiasts themselves make it clear that such equations were conjectural, ultimately deriving from Philochoros in the case of the first passage.[24] And other commentators on the second alleged reference had absurdly connected it with the long-dead Cleon. Even if one accepts that Euripides intended a contemporary allusion, his phrases are so commonplace that they cannot be assigned to a precise individual. One might wish to except from this stricture the adjective ἀθυρόγλωσσος (903), a word so rare that it could be taken to be a recognisable hit at a particular contemporary. Accept this, and a cognate temptation offers. Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 3. 7. 2) condemns the style of a Cleophon for expressions as silly as πότνια συκῆ. It is impossible to say whether this Cleophon is the demagogue, the tragic poet, or another. Earlier in the *Rhetoric* (1. 15. 13), the demagogue had been cited for his speech against Critias. An acceptable pattern emerges, especially if one believes that Aristotle is the author of the *Ath. Pol.*, a document contributing greatly to the bad reputation of Cleophon. However, when one recollects how widespread were the attacks on demagogues for their foreign parentage, sobriety rushes back and the structure collapses like the proverbial pack of cards. The *Orestes* is of no help to an investigation of Cleophon.

Oratorical and historiographical references to the demagogue afford disparate facts, desperate libels, and assorted clues. Isocrates[25] linked his name with that of Hyperbolus as the archetypal bad influence on the people; this copulation persists at least until the time of Aelian. Aeschines[26] represented him as the man who finally ruined Athens: the corrupt lyre-maker, once a slave in fetters, fraudulently enrolled as an Athenian, the briber of the people, the manic opponent of peace who threatened to slit the throat of any man who dared mention that word.

All good rip-roaring stuff, so far. And utterly conventional. We need talk no more about lyre-making and illegal citizenship. The allegation of former slavery is comparable to a fragment of Andocides,[27] who called Hyperbolus' father a branded slave still working at the public mint. As almost always, Cleophon and Hyperbolus are interchangeable types.

Andocides[28] announced in the *De Mysteriis* that the greatest disgrace to befall him during exile was the occupation of his house by lyre-making Cleophon. More about that later. The Aeschinean portrait is painted from the same palette as that used by the author of the *Ath. Pol.* In this document, Cleophon succeeds Cleon as the popular leader;[29] it is notable that Hyperbolus is suppressed altogether in this account. It is baldly stated that he introduced

24. See E. Delebecque, *Euripide et la Guerre du Péloponnèse* (1951), 302.
25. *De Pace* 75.
26. *De Legat.* 76; *In Ctes.* 150.
27. *Fr.* 5 (Blass).
28. *De Myst.* 146.
29. *Ath. Pol.* 28. 3.

the *diobelia*, later abolished by Callicrates, and was eventually executed (as was Callicrates also). In the other relevant passage of the *Ath. Pol.*,[30] Cleophon dissuades the people from accepting the Spartan peace proposals after Arginusae. He appears in the Assembly wearing a breast plate, and delivers a drunken speech urging that peace must depend upon Spartan surrender of all the cities.

Cleophon as the intransigent opponent of peace is a regular motif in the sources. But the circumstances keep changing. Lysias concentrates on the events after Aegospotami,[31] asserting that the demagogue based his opposition to peace on the Spartan demand for demolition of the Long Walls. Diodorus Siculus[32] introduced Cleophon as the opponent of peace in 410, after Cyzicus. Xenophon, by stark contrast, omits all three situations. Indeed, Cleophon is mentioned only once, on the occasion of his death: the parallel with Thucydides' treatment of Hyperbolus and Androcles is obvious.

Lysias has several things to say about Cleophon. Apart from the circumstances of his death, a matter for separate discussion, he draws attention[33] to the fact that Cleophon, whose influence had extended over 'many years', surprised everyone by dying a poor man and leaving his family and relatives in penury. It had been expected that he would make a lot of money out of his position. This negative compliment is partly offset elsewhere, in another comment on his death, where it is stated that there were good grounds for calling the demagogue a bad lot.[34]

A speech by Cleophon against Critias is mentioned in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle; the demagogue quoted Solon's poetry to prove the long-standing immorality of the oligarch's family. Many centuries later, Himerius[35] envisaged an attack by Cleophon on Alcibiades. One may note that Himerius[36] also had Hyperbolus prosecuting Nicias.

Finally, it is now known that a few Athenians voted for the ostracism of Cleophon on that marvellous occasion when the lamp-selling Hyperbolus was extinguished. Like father, like son, for Cleippides had also been voted against in an earlier ostracism. Also like brother, for at least one vote was cast against Philinos in the year of Hyperbolus' fall. It will be seen that this brother may be significant in the understanding of Cleophon's factional struggles.

What to make of all this? Cautious speculation and close analysis do not furnish a detailed reconstruction of the career of Cleophon, but they will put his factional position into clearer perspective. More importantly, he can be

30. 34. 1.
31. *In Agoratum* 8–12.
32. 13. 53.
33. *De Bonis Aristoph.* 48.
34. *In Nicomachum* 13.
35. *Ecl.* 36. 15.
36. *Ecl.* 36. 318.

rescued from some of the ancient libels, still perpetuated in too many modern accounts.

Cleippides[37] was sent as one of three generals against Mytilene in 428. Thucydides records the bald fact, passing no comment on Cleippides, and leaving his colleagues unnamed. He does not recur in the historian. It is usually reckoned that the votes for his ostracism belong to the celebrated occasion of 443, when Thucydides, son of Melesias, was ousted.[38] If so, he will not have been young in 428, and Cleophon could already have been of an age for politics. So also Philinos.

A father and two sons, candidates for ostracism between the years 443 and 417/16/15. Does this add up to a political family? It depends on what significance is accorded to these 'scatter votes'. Did some Athenians really think them important enough to be ostracised? Or were such votes cast merely out of non-political animus of a completely personal nature? It may even be conceivable that such men might vote against themselves in order to get some safe bit of political limelight.

It has been suggested that Cleophon and Hyperbolus were in concert at the time of the latter's eclipse.[39] There is no evidence for this, and, anyway, Androcles will have to be added to any such calculations. All three were natural rivals, though one or two or all of them could have favoured a short-term alliance against Alcibiades. With Hyperbolus gone, Androcles and Cleophon must be presumed to be amongst the agitators against Alcibiades during the brouhaha over the mutilation of the Hermae and the profanation of the Mysteries. Thucydides names no names,[40] which helps rather than hinders this proposition.

There are three related problems. Andocides is an obviously unreliable witness on the matter of the Mysteries. He assigns a leading role in the tortuous events to Androcles. Cleophon is only mentioned in the context of occupying his house in the period of exile. Nothing is said about the character or motives of Androcles. It could be inferred that Cleophon coveted the orator's house and put a political gloss on actions motivated by greed. But why does Andocides not make more of this? When his speech was delivered, it was already a convention to blacken Cleophon. But, again, such an imputation runs counter to Lysias' tribute to the surprising honesty of Cleophon. The point cannot be resolved, for both orators are always partial.

Second, there are (so far) no ostraca bearing the name of Androcles. This is surprising, and may only be an accident, since he is better attested as the leading

37. Thuc. 3. 3. 2; Diodorus, 12. 55. 3, calls him Cleinippides; see *PA* 8521.

38. Gomme, on Thuc. 3. 3. 2; Vanderpool, *Ostracism at Athens*, 27; Meiggs-Lewis, 42.

39. By F. Camon, *Giornale Italiano di filologia* 16 (1963), 147–51; see also Connor, 79–84.

40. 6. 27–29; however, in his reference to the murder of Androcles, it is said that the demagogue had been a prime opponent of Alcibiades in 415, and was liquidated to please the latter. The truth? Or merely a political assertion of 411?

demagogue in the period 415–411,[41] and must already have been known in the days of Hyperbolus.

Third, if Cleophon had attained any eminence before 411, why was he not liquidated as were Hyperbolus and Androcles? Perhaps he saw what was coming and got away from Athens. Or was he then holding the generalship assigned to him by the scholiast, untouchable for military and geographical reasons?

It has been seen that Aristophanes thought Cleophon worthy of mention in 411 along with such characters as Charminos. However, it is in 410–409 that the demagogue really emerges. He introduces the *diobelia*, procures the exile of Critias, and forces rejection of the Spartan peace overtures after Cyzicus.

Mercifully, the precise intent of the *diobelia* need not be discussed here.[42] Suffice it to say that Cleophon did not use his financial policies to line his own pockets, according to Lysias. Indeed, by 406, administration of the fund had passed to 'blear-eyed' Archedemus.[43] His attack on Critias was only one episode in a general paying-off of political scores after the restoration of the democracy.[44] It helps, however, to pave the way for the ultimate liquidation of the demagogue.

Cleophon's role as the preventer of peace has already been established as a regular motif, set in three separate contexts. Nor will it be forgotten that this is a logical extension of the older image of Cleon. An even simpler point needs to be kept in mind. Most hostile comment on Cleophon, ancient as well as modern, is conditioned by hindsight. To those who knew and know that Athens goes on to lose the war in 404, the refusals of Spartan overtures after Cyzicus and Arginusae naturally seem tragic errors, and the opponents of peace are inevitably branded as fools or knaves. But in 410 in particular, Athenian prospects looked good. Decisive victories against the Spartans, the restoration of the democracy, and (although no pleasure to Cleophon) the recall of Alcibiades combined to mitigate the memories of Sicily and induce a renewed confidence in the people. Would anyone seriously maintain that the advice of Pericles in such a situation would have been different from that of Cleophon?

Unhappily, the major source for this episode is Diodorus Siculus. Now Diodorus is not always a fool, and he does not invariably swallow the prejudices of his sources against popular leaders. For instance, on the matter of Cleon's death, he abandons Thucydides and has Cleon perish as bravely as Brasidas. However, one does not care to be reliant on him, and he presents a

41. On the influence of the various demagogues, see O. Reverdin, *Museum Helveticum* 2 (1945), 201–12.

42. For the record, I share the belief that it was a measure of poor relief, rather than pay for jurors or the Assembly, or the theoric fund.

43. Xenophon, *Hell*, 1. 7. 2.

44. See the discussion of C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (1952), 280–81.

typical picture of Cleophon as a corrupt persuader of the tragically misled populace.

And another factor is revealed by Diodorus. It does no great credit to Cleophon's 'patriotism', but goes a long way towards explaining his stand and the people's willingness to follow him. The Spartans sent, as their chief negotiator, Endius.[45] Now about Endius we know this. He had been sent to Athens years earlier, during the manoeuvres concerning a treaty between Athens and Argos. One reason for sending him was that he (and his colleagues) was supposed to be on good terms with the Athenians.[46] He appears in Book 8 of Thucydides as an ephor, as such a close friend of Alcibiades that he actually used the latter's name as part of his own style, and closely participant in the machinations of Alcibiades.[47] When this character appeared in Athens as the chief voice of Sparta, at a time when Alcibiades was supposed to be returning as the saviour of Athens, Cleophon had fair reason to suppose that he could smell a rat. These Spartan overtures will have seemed to him yet another Alcibiadean ploy. It is relevant to subjoin that Endius recurs as an ephor in 404:[48] he may well have had a hand in the liquidation of Cleophon.

The failures and final eclipse of Alcibiades disappointed Athenian hopes, and may (somewhat ironically) have affected the standing of the demagogue. It is, of course, possible that it was at this time that Cleophon attacked Alcibiades, though this incident (if it happened) could equally well be assigned to 415. Or, for that matter, to 410. Cleophon will hardly have wanted Alcibiades to return as the prospective saviour, and memories of the trick played on Hyperbolus (especially if Cleophon himself had been involved in that event) were surely uncomfortable. An attack on Alcibiades in 410 was ill-timed, but his success against Critias may have pushed the demagogue to over-confidence. At all events, in Xenophon's account of the prosecution of the generals after Arginusae, Cleophon plays no overt rule. The business is associated with Archedemus, currently in charge of the *diobelia* and described as the popular influence of the hour.[49]

In the *Ath. Pol.*, Cleophon returns at this juncture as the great villain: Archedemus, like Hyperbolus, finds no place in that document. The Spartans again offer peace, but are again rebuffed by Cleophon, who makes his famous appearance in the Assembly: drunk, and wearing a breast plate.

These colourful details cannot just be ignored as a piece of comedy-inspired malice. Politicians have been known to give speeches whilst intoxicated.[50] The breast plate could have been a gimmick, designed to show the Athenians that

45. 13. 52. 2.
46. Thuc. 5. 44. 3.
47. 8. 6. 3; 8. 12. 1; 8. 17.2.
48. Xenophon, *Hell.* 2. 3. 1, 10.
49. *Hell.* 1. 7. 2; see *PA* 2326 for Archedemus, also Connor, 139 n.3.
50. Sir John A. McDonald, the architect of Canadian confederation, now virtually canonised in the folklore of his country, is a pertinent example.

they could not relax their guard as soon as Sparta offered terms. Or it could have implied to the people that their popular leader walked in fear of violence from the oligarchs. On another level, it might have recalled the portraits of Pericles with his inevitable helmet, serving simultaneously as a favourable contrast to the fineries of Alcibiades. For the references in the *Ranae* demonstrate that the name of Alcibiades was a potent one as late as 405.

Then came the disaster at Aegospotami. Cleophon, always resilient in the wake of his policy's failures, appears yet again. This time, he causes rejection of the Spartan terms, objecting to their demand for a partial destruction of the Long Walls. His stand is usually regarded as his ultimate madness.

A cooler look is required. Lysias makes it quite clear that it was the issue of the Long Walls which was decisive.[51] They were a symbol to both sides; one remembers the rituals of propaganda with which the Spartans were to commence their destruction. Cleophon may be criticised for such obduracy over a symbol (a common enough fault with politicians), but his stand was genuinely popular. For Theramenes was compelled to offer as bait, when angling for the position of plenipotentiary ambassador to Sparta, the pledge that he would ensure that the walls would not be breached at all.

It may also be pertinent to subjoin a passage from Eupolis,[52] which suggests that the Long Walls symbolised the shelter of the evacuated country-folk against the urban population. Concern over their position, which may be related in general terms to his *diobelia*, may have sharpened Cleophon's resistance. It would also antagonise some of the demagogue's natural urban support, thus helping his political enemies contrive his ruin.

For there is no doubt at all that his downfall was arranged by his factional enemies, and that the formal charge against him was trumped-up. The details given by Xenophon and Lysias are discrepant, but complement each other and arrive at the same conclusion. Xenophon[53] omits all mention of Cleophon in the present context. The Athenian who advocated acceptance of the Spartan terms was Archestratus, a member of the Boule. He was imprisoned, and a decree was passed forbidding any proposal to accept the terms. Without pressing family connection or identification, one will bear in mind that an Archestratus had been appointed as one of the generals after Notium.[54]

Lysias[55] claims that Cleophon made a generalising assault on the Boule, asserting that its members were in conspiracy against the people. The charge is by no means wild, especially if one reads 'Cleophon' for 'the people'. The jailing of Archestratus must have raised the demagogue's hopes. They were soon to be fatally dashed.

51. *In Agoratum* 8–12.
52. Eupolis 110A (Edmonds, 346).
53. *Hell.* 2. 2. 15.
54. *Hell.* 1. 5. 16; Diodorus 13. 74, 1. Not our man, since he was dead before the episode in question, according to Lysias (21. 8).
55. *In Nicomachum* 10.

Xenophon passes over the liquidation of Cleophon in a vague sentence, asserting that he perished in a factional struggle.[56] True: but of equal significance is the suppression of names and details. Lysias supplies the full version (his version, of course), allotting space to the story in two speeches. In the longer account,[57] Cleophon is accused by the oligarchs on some sort of charge that he had evaded his military duties. The orator's formulation of the charge is odd, perhaps hinting at its frailty: ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅπλα ἀναπαυσόμενος. Whatever this means, Lysias insists that it was a false charge. His real offence was to have opposed the demolition of the Long Walls. Oligarchs brought the accusation, and Cleophon was condemned by a packed jury. His death is contrived after the departure of his natural enemy, Theramenes, who later returns to announce the betrayal of his own pledge to the people: the walls must, after all, come down.

In this version, no names are named. It is likely that the liquidation of Cleophon was agreed between the extreme oligarchs, Theramenes, and Endius. Absent friends such as Critias will not be overlooked! In Lysias' other account, it was Satyrus of Cephisia, a member of the Boule, who had Cleophon arrested. Since they did not expect a fair court to condemn him, Nicomachus was suborned to pass a law allowing the Boule to participate in the trial.

Satyrus and Nicomachus. Fascinating characters, both. The former is bracketed along with Chremon as one of the two dominant influences in the Boule. In Xenophon,[58] he is the 'most audacious and shameless' of the Eleven at Athens, the man who actually drags (how poetic!) Theramenes from the altar to his doom. Nicomachus (omitted by Xenophon) had been on or under the commission of Nomothetae during the entire period of Cleophon's attested eminence. It is obviously likely that the two had been enemies. An irony subsists. Nicomachus is accused, like an archetypal demagogue in comedy, of alien-cum-servile parentage and doubtful claims to citizenship.[59]

Such was the end of Cleophon. How did the oligarchs get away with it so easily? For no violence seems to have been used, unless some be inferred from Xenophon's talk of *stasis*. Several factors combine to provide an answer. Increasing distress in Athens must have turned more of Cleophon's old supporters against him. Hopes were now pinned on the promises of Theramenes, who had claimed that he could get better terms than those opposed by Cleophon. And at no time in Athens did one demagogue hold unchallenged sway. Cleophon had rivals on the popular side as well as his more obvious ones in the Boule, in Sparta, and in the ranks of the oligarchs in exile. The Athenians will not have seen his death as the automatic extinction of their leadership.

56. *Hell.* 1. 7. 35.
57. *In Agoratum* 8–12.
58. *Hell.* 2. 3. 54–6; see *PA* 12598.
59. See *PA* 10934.

Why was Cleophon not simply murdered, as Androcles and Hyperbolus had been? Crude assassination was probably eschewed because it would have revived memories of 411, and might well have united the people behind some new leader. And the oligarchs doubtless calculated that it would be to their advantage to show Sparta (in particular, Spartans such as Endius) that they could control Athens with at least a façade of legal authority. That would be a particular concern of Theramenes.

This paper is written on the assumption that the ostraca finds relate to the demagogue. To be honest, it is possible that they do not. However, no other Cleophon seems available as a candidate, and the equation is a fair one. The revelation of his paternity should finally warn us against accepting any slur by orators and comedians on a popular leader without vigilant investigation. Unmasked yet again (it cannot happen too often) are the suppressive techniques of Thucydides and Xenophon.

Puzzles, inconsistencies, and new revelations have merged and emerged from the analysis. Cleophon belonged to a highly political family, especially if his brother is the Philinus prosecuted by Antiphon for alleged embezzlement.[60] Let Cleippides the father be adduced for the last time: a candidate for ostracism in, perhaps, 443; a general in 428. Cleophon had a longish run in Athenian politics. A politician suppressed by Thucydides, played down by Xenophon. Not an irresponsible bawler, but an honest financial reformer and administrator. A man of war (perhaps even a general), but not unreasonably so when taken in the context of events. Not a belligerent coward, finally unmasked, but a victim of false charges brought by the real enemies of the people. In future, there will be no excuse for traducing him as a bad lot or an utterly and ruinously selfish demagogue.[61]

60. *Choreutes* 12, 21, 35f.; *fr.* 6 (Blass). The equation is suggested by, e.g., Vanderpool, *Ostracism at Athens*, 28.

61. Hignett, 283–4, is a good example, with his talk of Cleophon's "selfish folly". N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* (1959), 418, could blandly write that "Cleophon was executed for desertion." Even Vanderpool chatters on about Cleophon being "a bad lot", and about Cleophon and Philinus who together "went wrong." This sort of thing is no advance on Attic comedy and oratory.

VI

MEDICAL GROUNDS FOR EXEMPTIONS FROM MILITARY SERVICE AT ATHENS

With reference to A. W. Gomme's theory that there was at Athens, during the the period of the Peloponnesian war, a substantial group of men in the active-service age groups who were considered unfit for the field army but eligible for garrison duty (*CQ*, XXI [1927], 142–51; see also his *Population of Athens* [Oxford, 1933], pp. 4–5) Professor A. H. M. Jones writes: "A man might presumably be excused on a particular occasion if he were ill at the time, like the two Spartans who were sent back to base from Thermopylae because of an attack of ophthalmia (Herod. VII. 229). We know of no case at Athens, but we may conjecture that in such circumstances a man would, like Aeschines when he wished to evade an embassy, send in an affidavit (ἐξωμοσία) backed by a doctor's certificate (Dem. XIX. 124)."[1]

There is, however, evidence indicating that ophthalmia was accepted as a basis for temporary military exemption at Athens during the Peloponnesian War. It is supplied by Aristophanes' *Frogs*. In the scene between Charon, Dionysus, and the slave Xanthias, Charon declares that he will ferry no slave who did not take part in the sea battle περὶ τῶν κρεῶν; this latter phrase is notoriously obscure, but the incident in question is the battle of Arginusae. Xanthias protests that he did not fight "because I had ophthalmia" (190–92). The joke must allude to the feigning of ophthalmia as a pretext for avoiding active service.

A second point may be subjoined in support of Gomme's theory. Jones, I would suggest, underestimates the long-term effects of the plague; these effects must have increased the number of medically unfit Athenians. Thucydides (2. 49) remarks that many of the victims who recovered were left blind or crippled in the fingers or toes. Taken along with the victims of warfare who were alive but permanently disabled as regards active fighting, this would seem to indicate that the Athenian authorities would have no option but to create a class of disabled men, unfit for actual fighting, but of some use for garrison duty.

1. *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 162–63.

GREEK EPIGRAM

VII

THE USE OF *BINEIN KINEIN*

There has been much debate recently[1] over Henderson's[2] contention that *βινεῖν κινεῖν* are used only of violent and/or illicit intercourse, never a husband's normal relations with his wife.

No one has yet quoted, by way of refutation of this dogma, the following epigram from the Anthology by Nicarchus:

> *Οὐδεὶς τὴν ἰδίην συνεχῶς, Χαρίδημε, γυναῖκα*
> *κινεῖν ἐκ ψυχῆς τερπόμενος δύναται·*
> *οὕτως ἡ φύσις ἐστὶ φιλόκνισος, ἀλλοτριόχρως,*
> *καὶ ζητεῖ διόλου τὴν ξενοκυσθαπάτην.*
>
> (*AP* 11.7)

Or this one from the pen of Moschus:

> *Τὴν γραῦν ἐκκομίσας, φρονίμως πάνυ Μόσχος ἔγημε*
> *παρθένον· ἡ φερνὴ δ' ἔνδον ἔμεινεν ὅλη.*
> *Ἄξιον αἰνῆσαι Μόσχου φρένας, ὃς μόνος οἶδε*
> *καὶ τίνα δεῖ κινεῖν καὶ τίνα κληρονομεῖν.*
>
> (*AP* 11.202)

In the first of these two epigrams, the manuscript reading *κινεῖν* is retained by Dübner, Waltz, and Beckby; Paton printed *βινεῖν* (albeit not tampering with the second poem). The Planudean variant *αἰνεῖν* has little sense or point, and is no doubt one of that scholar's typical exercises in expurgation.[3]

The sexual meaning of *κινεῖν* (along with its compounds) might have originated as an euphemism, but it certainly became established as an obscenity in its own right. The presence of *βινεῖν* and *προσκινεῖσθαι*, in the same sentence in a fragment of Xenarchus (*ap.* Athenaeus 569D) is one proof of that. So are

[1] C. Collard, *LCM* 4 (1979) 213-14; A. H. Sommerstein, *LCM* 5 (1980) 47; H. D. Jocelyn, *LCM* 5 (1980) 65-67. The editor of that journal has since vetoed further contributions to the debate.

[2] J. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven 1975) 151-52.

[3] For the bowdlerising activities of Planudes, see E. J. Kenney, 'A Byzantine Version of Ovid,' *Hermes* 91 (1965) 224-27. *αἴνω*, a rarish synonym of *πτίσσω*, would have been a more interesting possibility; cp. the Latin *molo*. For a possibly obscene use of the cognate noun *πτισμός*, see Henderson, op. cit., 184.

jingles such as *βινεῖν καὶ κινεῖν* (Lucian, *Paras.* 10), phrases like *σκέλεα κινεῖν*,[4] and the creation of a desiderative verb *κινητιᾶν* which occurs in texts both with and without *βινητιᾶν* as a variant.[5] Where *βινεῖν* and *κινεῖν* co-exist as textual variants in the manuscripts of Aristophanes, palaeography rather than bowdlerisation appears to be responsible. Certainly, there is no pattern to suggest euphemism on the part of a particular scribe or tradition: the Ravenna manuscript has *κινεῖν* at *Ach.* 1052, *βινεῖν* at *Eq.* 364.

Words can gain or lose in strength of meaning in the development of any language. The most pertinent case is that of *ὀπυίω*. In Homer and other early poets, it means "marry." Solon, according to Hesychius, employed it of married love as the opposite to *βινεῖν*. Yet in later Greek, the verb came to mean simply having intercourse; Palladas (*AP* 10.56.7) provides a good example. The Latin *futuo* is also instructive. Although it may have had a respectable etymology in the Greek *φύω*, the word became an obscenity.[6] Martial, however, twice uses it for comic effect of marital sex: 9.41.5: *nempe semel futuit, generaret Horatius ut tres* (note the variant *saliit*); 11.71.1-2: *hystericam vetulo se dixerat esse marito/et queritur futui Leda necesse sibi.*

[4] Herodas 5.2; cf. the Latin *tollere pedes*, in indecent contexts such as Martial 11.71.7-8.

[5] Menander, *Dysc.* 462; cf. G. Pascucci, '*Κινητιᾶν*,' *Atene e Roma* n.s. 4 (1959) 102-5. The verb is found without variant in *Vita Aesopi* 32 (= Perry, *Aesopica*, p. 47); with variant *βινητιᾶν* in Plato Comicus (*ap.* Athenaeus 442A), on which see Cobet, *Variae Lectiones* (Leiden 1854) 218.

[6] This etymology, however, is not universally accepted; the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (for easy instance) regards the origins of *futuo* as "dubious."

VIII

MORE LOVE WITH DORIS

A few remarks prompted by O. J. Schrier's interesting article [1]) on *AP* 5, 55, subscribing throughout to his general principle of analysis: "We cannot interpret a single piece of Greek literature without thinking of the tradition of which it forms part".

1. ῥοδόπυγον. Dioscorides may or may not have coined the word. To Schrier's reasons for his selection of it, add the sexual meaning found in various rose words [2]). With regard to bright, rosy buttocks, an interesting late parallel is afforded by Liudprand of Cremona, an author beyond the purview of many classicists: *purpuream secus natium speroiden* [3]).

2. It may very well be that Doris is κελητίζουσα, an amatory position treated more openly elsewhere in the Anthology, Martial,

and the Roman novelists [4]); Ovid recommends it for short girls [5]). One detail perhaps pointing in this direction is the verb διαβᾶσα, employed in a *double entendre* on the subject by Aristophanes, *Lys.* 60: ἐπὶ τῶν κελήτων διαβεβήκασι. However, there is another possibility. Doris could be lying on the bed with her legs raised and feet crossed around the loins of her standing lover [6]). This would remain consonant with Schrier's interpretation of ὑπὲρ λεχέων διατείνας, and has the advantage of making ῥοδόπυγον more than ornamental.

3. δόλιχον. If Doris is κελητίζουσα, Schrier may be too cavalier in dismissing Gow-Page's notion of a horse race, given the usual more explicitly equestrian descriptions of such intercourse [7]). Yet the horse race does not have to be postulated, whatever Doris' position. Add to Schrier's exclusively Latin examples *AP* 5, 75 (Rufinus): ἥνυσα πολλὰ καμών (notice ἥνυσα, Dioscorides' own verb); *AP* 5, 264 (Paulus Silentiarius): δολιχῆς ἔργα νυχεγρεσίης, for emphasis on the duration of amatory effort.

4. ὄμμασι . . . πορφύρεα. Schrier rightly devotes much space to the problem of what these lines mean. πορφύρεα is certainly ambiguous. The adjective was very widely applied by Greek writers [8]). Indeed, Athenaeus (13. 604a-b) reports an ancient criticism of Phrynichus for using it to describe a boy's cheeks; in challenging this, the tragedian Sophocles quotes a verse of Simonides in which it is employed of a girl's mouth.

In my view, there must be a contrast between dullness and brightness in these lines. Unlike Schrier, I think Gow-Page were on the right lines in suggesting that τὰ πορφύρεα may be an elegant way of saying breasts. Except that thighs and buttocks are more to the point. A clue is provided by Rufinus' description of a competition for pygal beauty (*AP* 5, 35) [9]). It is said of one contender that when she spread her legs (διαιρομένης; cf. Dioscorides' διατείνας), the colour of her skin changed from white to red. Contrast *AP* 5, 203 (Asclepiades), where Lysidice, who is κελητίζουσα, rode so lightly (κοῦφα τινασσομένης, as opposed to Doris' ἔτρεμε) that her thighs never reddened. Changes of colour during coition are clearly an established literary motif [10]). Add, finally, that Rufinus twice (*AP* 5, 35; 5, 60) employs the simple verb σαλεύομαι of female buttocks, and we can appreciate how Dioscorides, in coining (or at least in using a very rare word) the compound ἀμφισαλεύομαι is imparting linguistic novelty to a thematic commonplace.

1) *Love with Doris*, Mnem. IV 32 (1979), 307-26.

2) See Hesychius, s.v. ῥόδον, and schol. Theocr. 11, 10 for the sexual meanings of ῥόδον and ῥοδωνία.

3) *Antapodosis* 4, 11 (ed. J. Becker, Hanover, 1915; earlier text in Migne, *PL* 136. 863a).

4) *AP* 5, 202-4; Martial 11, 104; Petronius *Sat.* 140; Apuleius *Met.* 2, 17.

5) *AA* 3, 777. Compare his straightforward prescription, and the complaisant acceptance of this position by the young girl in Petronius, *loc. cit.*, with the stuffy attitude of Lucretius 4, 1274-77, adduced by Schrier in support of J. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven 1975), 164, on the supposed "naughtiness" of this mode of intercourse.

6) Also advised by Ovid, *AA* 3, 781-2; this is the interpretation of C. Forberg, *A Manual of Classical Erotology* (London 1844; repr. New York 1966), 1, 33.

7) *AP* 5, 202-3 work out the image in full detail; cf. *Hectoreo equo* in both Ovid *AA* 3, 778, and Martial 11, 105.

8) It is hard to fathom Gow-Page's claim that the adjective is "improbable" of hair; see, for easy instance, Lucian *De salt.* 41 (the purple hair of the Nisus/Scylla story); Pseudo-Lucian *Amor.* 26.

9) See the commentary of Page, *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge 1978), 83; cf. my *Rufinus*, *AP* 5, 60, JHS 100 (1980), forthcoming.

10) Something that enhances Schrier's point concerning the strong connection of πορφύρεος with Aphrodite. To his examples, add *AP* 5, 202 (Plango's purple whip, remembering that she is κελητίζουσα); 5, 205 (purple wool as part of an offering to Aphrodite); 12, 112 (the purple cord with which Aphrodite binds Eros).

IX

ASCLEPIADES AP V 210

The much suspected opening words of this poem, τῷ θαλλῷ, may in fact be correct. They could, in spite of Gow-Page, stand for the flower of youth. A second possibility is that the noun means 'wand', comporting a phallic *double-entendre*. Or else it may mean 'gift', a rare and neglected, but papyrologically attested meaning of the word. If emendation is still preferred, τῷ θάλπει seems the best bet, given the frequency of heat metaphors for erotic feeling in classical poetry.

τῷ θαλλῷ Διδύμη με συνήρπασεν. ὤμοι, ἐγὼ δέ
τήκομαι ὡς κηρὸς πὰρ πυρί, κάλλος ὁρῶν.
εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί τοῦτο; καὶ ἄνθρακες· ἀλλ' ὅτε κείνους
θάλψωμεν, λάμπουσ' ὡς ῥόδεαι κάλυκες.

Although printed and translated without qualms by Paton ('by the branch') and Beckby ('mit ihrer Schönheit'), the opening of this poem has been much suspected [1] and emended. Of the various conjectures [2], τῷφθαλμῷ (or one of the variants thereon) commands the most powerful support [3]; Dübner accepted Boissonade's τῷ θαλερῷ, with Waltz distinctly the odd man out in printing Lumb's [4] τωθασμῷ ('par ses taquineries'). There are, however, various grounds for supposing that the manuscript reading [5] may in fact be correct.

---

[1] Most recently by D. H. Garrison, *Mild Frenzy: a Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram*, Wiesbaden 1978, p. 52, who, notwithstanding his tentative rendering 'by her youthfulness', obelises the text.

[2] Repertories of which are furnished by Dübner, Stadtmüller, and Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965, II, p. 120. One would never know from Paton and Beckby that there was any dispute at all!

[3] Originated by Jacobs, the eyes have it in Wilamowitz (? see later, n. 28), Ruhnken, Gow-Page, and, most recently, W. Ludwig, «Die Kunst der Variation im hellenistischen Liebesepigramm», *L'Epigramme Grecque*, Geneva 1968, p. 316.

[4] T. W. Lumb, *Notes on the Greek Anthology*, London 1920, p. 16 («by her taunts»); Gow-Page do not discuss this suggestion.

[5] Doubts about which ultimately derive from the corrector's marginal ζήτει τὴν ἔννοιαν in *P*.

1. In spite of Gow-Page's contemptuous dismissal, θάλῳ *could* denote the flower of youth or beauty, given similar use of the cognates θάλλειν and θάλος, not to mention the ubiquity of ἄνθος in this sense [6]. And indeed, the reading has been so defended [7]. Additional support for this line of defence is provided by the frequency with which the images of flower and fire are coupled in epigram and elsewhere [8].

2. Gow-Page's ridicule of Toup [9] for adducing Plato, *Phaedo* 230 D (τὰ πεινῶντα θρέμματα θαλλὸν ἤ τινα καρπὸν προσείοντες ἄγουσι) in support of the reading rather clouds the issue. The point about this passage is that it permits the idea that Didyme attracted the poet by waving a wand at him. Girls often take this sort of initiative in pastoral and elsewhere, usually with sexual or magical intentions. An obvious case in point is Vergil, *Ecl.* III 64: *malo me Galatea petit, lasciua puella.* There is also *Ciris* 376-7 where, in a very rare example of the Latin *thallus*, a branch is one of the items used in Thessalian magic to enchant a man's mind [10]. Less familiar is a passage in Athenaeus (XIII 587 A) in which, with the support of a quotation from Sophocles, it is established that *thalloi* are the favourite food of goats, especially she-goats. The lechery and greed of this animal were proverbial [11]. In the light of this, the goatish Didyme could be luring her equally hircine prey

---

[6] In addition to those provided by *LSJ*, many more examples could be furnished from *AP* V and XII. See, e. g., V 144 (Meleager), V 231 (Macedonius Consul), and best (which is to say worst) of all XII 256, where in 12 lines of endless repetition Meleager does this entire stock of images to death. Notice also ἱερὸν θάλος (V 194, Asclepiades or Posidippus) of female beauty, for which Gow-Page could adduce no exact parallel. In fact, the same phrase is used by Gregory Nazianzen in one of his tedious exercises (*AP* VIII 32).

[7] By L. Broccia, «Θαλλός in Asclepiade», *Parola del Passato* 16, 1951, pp. 54-61, of which Gow-Page seem unaware, though in view of their avowed policy of not mentioning modern literature it is hard to be sure. Cf. O. Knauer, *Die Epigramme des Asklepiades von Samos*, Würzburg 1935, p. 52.

[8] Discussed with copious examples by E. K. Borthwick, «Fire Imagery in Two Poems in the Anthology», *CP* 64, 1969, pp. 114-5.

[9] This line of defence is credited by Dübner not to Toup but to N. Piccolos, *Supplément à l'Anthologie grecque contenant des épigrammes et autres poésies légères inédites, précédé d'observations sur l'Anthologie*, Paris 1853, a relatively neglected work (apparently unknown to Beckby and, although sometimes mentioned in their notes, not in Gow-Page's register of editions and anthologies) and currently inaccessible to me. Broccia, *art. cit.*, p. 61, also appeals to the Plato passage.

[10] See the long note on this in the edition of R. O. A. M. Lyne, Cambridge 1978; cf. Nonnus, *Dionys.* XI 510, where one of the Seasons wears a *thallus* in magical ritual.

[11] *AP* IX 317 (Anon.); Theocritus I 87-8, V 39-42; Lucian, *Ep. Sat.* 28. Elsewhere (XIII 582 F), Athenaeus adduces Machon for the proper names or nicknames Aix and Thallus (cf. Thallousa, XIII 587 F).

by brandishing a piece of their favourite food, a standard combination of vegetable and sexual imagery in Hellenistic epigram [12].

3. Hunting for phallic symbols is a dangerous critical pastime. Nevertheless, wands and suchlike frequently *do* stand for the penis: κορύνη and ῥωπαλόν for instance in Greek [13], *ramus* and *thyrsus* in Latin [14]. Asclepiades, no stranger to obscenity [15], might intend a vulgar double meaning here, a notion supportable by the comparable use of συναρπάζειν in sexual action [16] and by the frequency of snatching away flowers in the language of rape [17]. One might add that the heroine's very name comports a touch of sexiness appropriate to the forward behaviour suggested here. Didyme, not a common appellation [18], is singled out by Athenaeus (XIII 576 F) as the most extraordinarily beautiful member of the harem of Ptolemy Philadelphus [19]. Perhaps even more to the point, her name is suggestive of δίδυμοι, a slang term for testicles [20].

4. Finally, for those who prefer a *double-entendre* without a phallic symbol, the tertiary meaning of θαλλός, neglected by Gow-Page and commentators in general, might be considered. In papyri [21] from the

---

[12] The best example is *AP* IX 563 (Leonidas), elucidated as «a jewel of Hellenistic obscenity» by G. Giangrande, «Fifteen Hellenistic epigrams», *JHS* 95, 1975, pp. 31-4. Alternatively, Dydime might be seen as a coy heroine in that some authors represent a *thallus* of olive as Athene's symbol of chastity: *AP* IX 586 (Cometas Chartularius); Nonnus, XII 112, XVI 30.

[13] *AP* V 129 (Automedon), XVI 261 (Leonidas); for tools as phallic symbols in comedy, cf. J. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, New Haven 1975, pp. 120-4. In vulgar English, the words «tool» and «rod» are used to denote the male organ.

[14] Novius, in Non. 116, 26; Apuleius, Ἀνεχόμενος 16. Cf. P. Pierrugues, *Glossarium Eroticum Linguae Latinae*, Paris 1826, pp. 432, 488.

[15] Cf. Giangrande, «Hellenistische Epigramme», *Eranos* 65, 1967, pp. 39-40, on *AP* XII 161; Garrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-61.

[16] Aristophanes, *Lys.* 437.

[17] And of epitaph; for the image of the flower of life, and the untimely death of a young girl as a kind of rape, see R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1962, p. 195, to which it might be added (for present purposes) that in Nonnus, *Dionys.* XXVII 239, XXVIII 21, the *thallus* is a lethal weapon in battle. Such conscious transfer of figures from theme to theme would, of course, be in the best traditions of Hellenistic epigram.

[18] Not apparently a creature of myth, Didyme earns very few references from real life in Pape-Benseler, *Griechische Eigennamen*, and none at all in D. C. Swanson, *The Names in Roman Verse*, Madison 1967. Elsewhere in *AP*, there is only the marginal character in VII 521 (Callimachus).

[19] Who was more or less coeval with Asclepiades —not, of course, that I intend any precise equation.

[20] *AP* V 126 (Philodemus).

[21] *LSJ* furnish several examples; cf. pseudo-Callisthenes I 32.

second century B. C. (not too far from Asclepiades' own time) on, θαλλός stands for a gift of any sort. As Giangrande [22] has shown, it is typical of Hellenistic epigrammatists to employ a word in a rare sense. Asclepiades is conceivably saying that Didyme seduced him with a gift (i. e. of her sexual favours); for the language, compare Libanius, *Ep.* I 212: εἴλκετο τῷ θαλλῷ.

In spite of these various proposals, emendation may still be thought preferable. As Gow-Page concede, the fashionable remedy, albeit palaeographically simple, is unwelcome in the singular [23], unless (a possibility they do not consider) we take it to mean that Didyme winked at the poet [24]. More elaborate versions [25] contrived to fit the plural run the risk of being mere rewriting. Still more so, despite Gow-Page's cautious compliment that he was «perhaps on the right lines», does Scaliger's ἡ Θαλλὼ Διδύμης, importing a third character [26]. It is, I suppose, an open question whether τῷφθαλμῷ... κάλλος ὁρῶν is effective antithesis or inept repetition. The latter view would rule out Meineke's τῷ κάλλει. Lumb's τωθασμῷ (printed, as we saw, in Waltz' Budé) makes no sense unless Asclepiades is presumed to have been a masochist: few men, certainly not poets of the Greek Anthology, are captivated by insults [27].

One possibility might be τῷ θάλπει [28], referring to the heat (physical, emotional, or a combination of both) of Didyme's passion. Since Asclepiades seems happy in his love [29], the notion of passion on the girl's

---

22 In his *JHS* article, cited above.

23 Both Propertius I 1, 1 and his model Meleager (*AP* XII 101), usually cited in discussions of the present problem, have the plural, as does *AP* XII 72 (Meleager), where the image of burning is also exploited. Ludwig, reviewing Gow-Page (*Gnomon* 38, 1966, p. 23), defends it as a «repräsentativen Singular» with various parallels (e. g. *AP* V 162, where Asclepiades says «nail» for «nails» under no metrical exigency).

24 It is worth recalling that the twitching of the right eye was regarded as an omen, something found in an amatory context in Theocritus III 37.

25 Such as Ruhnken's τὼφθαλμὼ Διδύμης με συνήρπασαν.

26 Cf. Broccia, *art cit.*, p. 54, n. 1, for objections to the placement of the article here, adducing *AP* V 164 (Asclepiades).

27 *LSJ* lend no support to Waltz' interpretation of τωθασμός as gentle teasing; cf. Broccia, *art. cit.*, p. 59, n. 2, for other objections to this notion.

28 Which I at first thought was unique to myself. I then found it attributed to Wilamowitz in Stadtmüller's *apparatus*, and ran it to earth in his «Parerga», *Hermes* 14, 1879, p. 166. Gow-Page make no mention of this conjecture, attributing to Wilamowitz only support for the idea of eyes, something I have not been able to verify (it is, for instance, not in the detailed discussions of his *Hellenistische Dichtung*).

29 Though Garrison, *op. cit.*, p. 53, regards the poet's feelings towards Didyme as ambivalent.

part is tenable. Both this noun and its cognate verb are used in erotic contexts [30], and there would be the possible advantage [31] of introductory consonance with the images of fire and heat that prevail throughout the epigram.

[30] Above all, the present poem apart, *AP* XII 17 (of uncertain authorship, but possibly by Asclepiades; cf. Gow-Page, *HE*, II, p. 142), an erotic epigram containing the image of burning.

[31] This suggestion would be subject to the aforementioned considerations of balance and iteration, in view of θάλψωμεν in the last line.

X

RUFINUS, *AP* v 60

παρθένος ἀργυρόπεζος ἐλούετο, χρύσεα μαζῶν
χρωτὶ γαλακτοπαγεῖ μῆλα διαινομένη·
πυγαὶ δ' ἀλλήλαις περιηγέες εἱλίσσοντο
ὕδατος ὑγροτέρῳ χρωτὶ σαλευόμεναι·
τὸν δ' ὑπεροιδαίνοντα κατέσκεπε πεπταμένη χείρ
οὐχ ὅλον Εὐρώταν ἀλλ' ὅσον ἠδύνατο.

An interesting poem, though not without its difficulties. Eurotas in the last line has traditionally been regarded as an obscene synonym for the female genitals. Sir Denys Page, however, challenged this in in his recent edition of Rufinus.[1] Other matters of language and style are also worth discussing for the light that they may throw on the techniques of a late Greek epigrammatist.[2] Hence the following analysis takes the form of a commentary.

The subject of the poem is a girl bathing. Page claims that it has no parallel in the Anthology. That overlooks the adumbration of this same theme by Antiphilus (*AP* v 307) – instructive, in that it describes Leda bathing in the Eurotas.

Otherwise, Rufinus doubtless intended his readers to think of such mythological sequences as the Artemis/Actaeon episode. The Ovidian version (*Met.* iii 181 f.) exhibits the motif of concealment of the *pudenda*. Most relevant is the description of Semele bathing in Nonnus (vii 237 f.), where the phrase *παρθένον ἀργυρόπεζαν* is strikingly similar to Rufinus' opening words. The Nonnan treatment offers a variant of the motif of concealment: Zeus, with modest eyes, averts his gaze from Semele's *αἰδοῖα*.

1. *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge 1978) 91-2.

2. Pages makes out a convincing case for a late date. See one or two additional remarks below in support. For completeness' sake, it may be noticed that Page was unaware of J.M. Dryall, *The Poems of Rufinus* (Ottawa 1974), in which (7) it is asserted without argument that Rufinus was 'an Ionian of the second century before Christ'.

1. ἀργυρόπεξος. Only here in this form, according to Page. In fact, it occurs in Pollux ii 192, as an epithet of Thetis, which suggests that it co-existed with the Homeric formula in the poetic tradition (cf. *Il.* i 538, *Od.* xxiv 92, and elsewhere). Girls and goddesses regularly have silvery limbs in poets of the Anthology.[3] But it seems most likely that Rufinus here has Thetis in mind; elsewhere[4] he ascribes silver feet to her.

χρύσεα. Page translates as 'shining', regarding this usage as uncommon outside Rufinus.[5] But it may be more effective to translate it literally. The girl has silver feet and golden breasts – quite a metallurgical miscellany! Along with this consider

2. γαλακτοπαγεῖ. The suffix has no force, Page claims, adducing *AP* xii 204, where that might be the case.[6] But Rufinus surely has in mind Theoc. xi 20, where Polyphemus apostrophises Galatea as λευκοτέρα πακτᾶς ποτιδεῖν.[7] The full force of the epithet adds to the overall humour of Rufinus' description of the girl's body.

3. Page rightly takes ἀλλήλαις as a dative of competition, defending it against the abysmal conjectures advanced by earlier critics. Rufinus *AP* v 36 (on girls in a beauty contest) provides a reasonable parallel: ἤρισαν ἀλλήλαις. Furthermore, there may be a word-play on the expression πρὸς πυγὴν ἄλλεσθαι,[8] a notion perhaps reinforced by the presence of σαλευόμεναι in the next line.

4. ὑγροτέρῳ χρωτί. 'Another loose dative, presumably with σαλευόμεναι.' Page may be too cautious here. Rufinus *AP* v 35 discloses the parallel τρυφερῷ χρωτὶ σαλευομένη. The line under discussion is compared by Page to one in *AP* ix 709 (Philip) describing a statue of the Eurotas. Coincidence of language and theme is seen by Page as just that. Yet it is at least possible that Rufinus re-worked the language and theme of a serious epigram for the purpose of humour, if not actual parody.

5. ὑπεροιδαίνοντα. Only here, according to Page and LSJ. In fact, Gregory of Nyssa twice uses the verb, once metaphorically of the human

3. E.g. v 255 (silver knee); v 272 (silver neck); xii 72 (silver shoulders).

4. *AP* v 48, *cf.* v 90 (also by Rufinus) for Thetis' distinctive feet.

5. Page claims the usage for *AP* v 27 and v 48, both serious poems; also for *AP* xii 93 (Rhianus).

6. Though not necessarily so, since Strato's poem is a light-hearted comment on traditional epithets and poetic formulae.

7. The full meaning is emphasised in Ovid's imitation (*Met.* xiii 796): *mollior et cygni plumis et lacte coacto*; cf. Theoc. xi 20-6. The Theocritean flavour may be enhanced by recollecting that Polyphemus is there in the role of a komast, with the sea-shore as his mistress's threshold; *cf.* F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 145.

8. Ar. *Lys.* 82; *cf.* Ath. xii 554c for competitions in pygal beauty between girls.

heart.[9] Such a provenance might imply that the word is a late one, thus lending some small support to Page's dating of Rufinus.

Page adduces ὑπεροιδάω from Lucian: it actually occurs in *Amores* 53, in some eyes pseudo-Lucian. The context is of interest and relevance: swelling nipples in a pederastic sequence. One can add that the verb is glossed by Pollux viii 79.[10]

This concordance with the *Amores* is striking, for the latter piece furnishes an account of the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles containing the gesture described in Rufinus' poem: πᾶν δὲ τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς ἀκάλυπτον οὐδεμιᾶς ἐσθῆτος ἀμπεχούσης γεγύμνωται, πλὴν ὅσα τῇ ἑτέρᾳ χειρὶ τὴν αἰδῶ λεληθότως ἐπικρύπτει. (*Am.* 13).

κατέσκεπε. Page cites *AP* v 294 (Agathias) and vi 250 (Antiphilus) for this verb, adding that it is quite common in prose of the early imperial period. Both references are false: Agathias has the simple verb, Antiphilus the different compound περισκέπω. And LSJ offers only the Rufinus passage and a fragment of Musonius in Stobaeus. What the reader needs to know is that the verb occurs twice in Nonnus (ii 110; xi 494), in both cases of concealment of the breasts.

πεπταμένη χεὶρ. Page does not comment on this. But the phrase may be crucial to an appreciation of Rufinus' comic use of language and motifs, and to the Eurotas conceit. Verb and noun were used together of swimming, from Homer to Nonnus.[11] In addition, the verb and its cognates occur in revelatory contexts, some comporting a sexual *double-entendre*, namely the motif of exposure of the female genitals.[12]

The Suda,[13] citing the last two lines, adduces this poem for the use of Eurotas as an obscene synonym for the female genitals. Jacobs discerned a pun on one who is *nimio Veneris usu* εὐρυτιώσης; Dübner, Waltz, and Beckby concur. For Page, the expression is 'unintelligible', the point 'wholly obscure'. Taking *parthenos* in its literal sense, he rejects the bawdy connection with εὐρυτιάω or εὐρύς as inappropriate.[14]

However, a glance at LSJ confirms that *parthenos* was regularly applied

9. Migne, *PG* xlv 676b; xlvi 609b.

10. Notice also ὑπεροιδέω in Galen (xix 71 Kühn).

11. Homer *Od.* v 374; Nonn. x 169-70.

12. *AP* ix 86 (Antiphilus) and Opp. *Cyn.* iii 414. For the employment of swimming in a sexual sense, *cf.* J.J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (Yale 1975) 161-6. Conceivably there is also a hint of female masturbation in Rufinus' lines (*cf.* Henderson 221-2).

13. E 3709 (Adler); *cf.* Eustath. *Od.* 1478. 39.

14. A referee pointed out that despite scholarly usage the verb εὐρυτιάω is unknown to LSJ.

to girls who were not virgin. To their examples[15] one may add *AP* xii 7, where Strato employs the noun in a register of the sexual amenities offered by girls and boys.

Page makes some play with the fact that the Suda cites this use of Eurotas only from the present poem. True, one might readily agree that the locution was not common; the muddled state of the Suda' notice possibly attests to that.[16] But the fact that only one example is given does not imply that only one *could* be given. There are countless items in the Suda illustrated by a single reference.

Acknowledging Ovid's very pertinent *ipsa Venus pubem, quotiens velamina ponit, / protegitur laeva semireducta manu* (*AA* ii 613-14), Page suggests a distinction between *pubes* and *pudenda*: it is the former which a girl tries to hide, and a play on Eurotas will only work in respect of the latter. However, *pubes* is a flexible term, readily interchangeable with *pudenda*.[17]

The vagina is commonly described in terms of its width (*cf.* comedy's εὐρύπρωκτος). Hence a pun on εὐρύς would be quite in keeping. Another motif present is that of a girl's accidental or deliberate exposure of her sex thanks to scanty clothing or none at all. This has been amply demonstrated by Giangrande,[18] with particular reference to *AP* xii 161 (Asclepiades). In the manner of most of his poetic brethren, Rufinus is playing with, and expanding upon, the *Motivik* of erotic epigram.

Rufinus may or may not have been the first, or only, writer to employ Eurotas in this way. That is not the chief issue, albeit evidence of originality, however small, is always welcome in a late author. What Page and other commentators have ignored is the technique whereby proper names were used to indicate the female parts, essentially a device of Old

15. *Il.* ii 514; Pind. *P.* iii 34; Soph. *Trach.* 1219; Ar. *Nub.* 530 (with Dover's n.).

16. Having asserted that the reference is to the *male* organ, the lexicographer subjoins a quotation from *AP* vii 531 (not 551, as Adler) by Antipater on the subject of Thermopylae, where the Eurotas is mentioned but undeniably without obscene allusion.

17. For a clear instance, see Apul. *Met.* ix 12; *cf.* Verg. *Aen.* iii 427; Ov. *Am.* iii 12. 21.

18. Hellenistische Epigramme', *Eranos* lxv (1967) 38-9, reproduced in *L'Epigramme Grecque* (Geneva 1967) 344-5. One item of substance can be added to the discussion of *AP* xii 161 by both Giangrande and Gow-Page. The imperfect ἔφαν€ is used of the girl's revelation. Gow-Page found this tense 'disconcerting'; Giangrande defends it as 'descriptiv'. In fact, the identical tense and phrase (ἔφαινε μηρόν) occur in the *Oeneus* of the tragedian Chaeremon (Ath. xiii 608b). The context is of girls exposing their charms through torn and scanty clothing. Similarity of theme and language suggests a common poetic tradition.

Comedy,[19] but also of Rufinus himself: elsewhere (*AP* v 36), he uses the name Meriones for *pudenda*.[20] Also pertinent is the constant use of geographical and topographical terms in indecent *double-entendre*.[21]

Conscious exploitation of comic devices would suit Rufinus. The poem is primarily humorous, its author (as Waltz calls him) an *ironiste*. It may be that Rufinus jokily selected the Eurotas, apart from its etymological appropriateness,[22] because of its handy associations with myth and beauty. Sparta was the city with the loveliest women;[23] and the Eurotas had been the venue for Leda and the swan.[24]

19. A register of such names (in some cases used of the anus) is furnished by Hsch. s.v. 'Aristodemos'. *Cf.* Henderson (n. 12) 147-8 for refs.

20. Where Page (unlike other edd.) is surely wrong in printing it with a small *m*.

21. The Melian Gulf, for instance, is applied to the anus, the Isthmos to the vagina; *cf.* Henderson (n. 12) 135-6, 149, and *passim* (as 135 n. 142, he adduces the names Rhodope and Rhodocleia from a poem of Rufinus, *AP* v 36, as examples of obscene word-play).

22. Another factor may well be the common use of water as symbol and scenery in erotic poetry; *cf.* C.P. Segal, *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Hermes Einzels. xxiii (Wiesbaden 1969) 23-33.

23. *Od.* xiii 412; *cf.* the discussion in Ath. xiii 566a.

24. See *AP* v 307 (Antiphilus) on a picture of this episode.

XI

NOTES ON RUFINUS

In editing Rufinus,[1] Denys Page performed a more valuable service than he was disposed to admit.[2] It is precisely this type of minor poet that most stands in need of close attention. His commentary, however, is somewhat circumscribed, and contains a certain amount of linguistic misinformation.[3] Hence these notes, offered as friendly supplement, with the pleasant bonus of providing information that supports Page's own late date for the poet.

In what follows, text and numeration are those of Page, with the standard Anthology reference added in parentheses. All unattributed quotations are Page's own words.

1(5.9) Ῥουφῖνος τῇι 'μῇι γλυκερωτάτηι 'Ελπίδι πολλά
χαίρειν, εἰ χαίρειν χωρὶς ἐμοῦ δύνασαι.
οὐκέτι βαστάζω, μὰ τὰ σ' ὄμματα, τὴν φιλέρημον
καὶ τὴν μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίην,
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ δακρύοισι πεφυρμένος ἢ 'πὶ Κορησσόν
ἔρχομαι ἢ μεγάλης νηὸν ἐς 'Αρτέμιδος.
αὔριον ἀλλὰ πάτρη με δεδέξεται, ἐς δὲ σὸν ὄμμα
πτήσομαι. ἐρρῶσθαι μυρία σ' εὐχόμενος.

Page found no epigrammatic parallel for the epistolary form. One of sorts is afforded by a satiric couplet against Marcus Aurelius, preserved by Ammianus Marcellinus (25. 4. 16): *οἱ βόες οἱ λευκοὶ Μάρκῳ τῷ Καίσαρι χαίρειν/ἄν πάλι νικήσῃς, ἄμμες ἀπωλόμεθα.*

The language of Rufinus here offers a possible clue to his period. On the evidence of the papyri,[4] his opening formula (*χαίρειν*) hardly ever occurs after the fourth century, whilst the closing one is not found before the second. This may enhance Page's location of the poet in the fourth century A.D.[5]

βαστάζω. Page adduces only *AP* 10.99.4 (Palladas) outside Christian

[1] *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge 1978).

[2] Witness his curiously apologetic preface.

[3] Excessive reliance upon *LSJ* caused some of this, also a reluctance to look beyond the epigrammatic tradition. On this latter point, cf. the judicious review by R. C. McCail, *CR* 29 (1979) 211–212.

[4] As assembled by B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek non-literary Papyri* (Athens 1973) 305, 319; cf. H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki 1956).

[5] As against J. M. Dyroff, *The Poems of Rufinus* (Ottawa 1974), a work unknown to Page, in which (7) it is asserted without argument that the poet was an Ionian of the second century B.C.

literature for the metaphorical use of this verb. There is a possible example at *AP* 9.416.6 (Philip of Thessalonica).

φιλέρημον. A rare compound, as Page says. Note the cognate verb φιλερημέω (not in *LSJ*), Palladius, *V. Chrys.* 19 (p. 123.11 Coleman-Norton).

διαζυγίην. "Apparently not elsewhere." It can be found in Hesychius, *s.v.* Διωρίαν. Page subjoins that διάζευξις is very rare. Not so: it is common in patristic Greek: Gregory Nazianzenus, *Or.* 6.2 (*PG* 35.721C); 7.22 (*PG* 35.784C); John Chrysostom, *De Sacerd.* 5.2 (p. 129.10; 1.416A Nairn); Methodius, *De Resurrect.* 1.38 (*PG* 41.1105A); Eustratius, *V. Eutych.* 98 (*PG* 86.2384D).

3(5.14)

Εὐρώπης τὸ φίλαμα καὶ ἦν ἄχρι χείλεος ἔλθῃ
ἡδύ γε, κἂν ψαύσῃ μοῦνον ἄχρι στόματος·
ψαύει δ' οὐκ ἄκροις τοῖς χείλεσιν, ἀλλ' ἐρίσασα
τὸ στόμα τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξ ὀνύχων ἀνάγει.

Europa. "Very rare except in myth, but occurs in Antipater of Thessalonica, 5.109." There is also inscriptional attestation: *CIL* 6.8997 (*ILS* 5174); 14.2795 (*ILS* 272); *CIG* 2163b; *SEG* 25 (1971) 503.

For a comprehensive treatment of the soul and the lover's kiss, see the little-known article of S. Gaselee, "The Soul in the Kiss," *Criterion* 2 (1924) 349–359.

4(5.15)

ποῦ νῦν Πραξιτέλης, ποῦ δ' αἱ χέρες αἱ Πολυκλείτου
αἱ ταῖς πρόσθε τέχναις πνεῦμα χαριζόμεναι;
τίς πλοκάμους Μελίτης εὐώδεας ἢ πυρόεντα
ὄμματα καὶ δειρῆς φέγγος ἀποπλάσεται;
ποῦ πλάσται, ποῦ δ' εἰσὶ λιθοξόοι; ἔπρεπε τοίνι
μορφῆι νηὸν ἔχειν ὡς μακάρων ξοάνωι.

"The theme has no precedent in the Anthology." McCail pointed out the most exact parallel in George of Pisidia, *Heracl.* 1.93. Add Lucian, *Imag.* 3 and *passim*, to Page's quotations from Plautus and Philostratus for intimations of the theme.

5(5.18)

μᾶλλον τῶν σοβαρῶν τὰς δουλίδας ἐκλεγόμεσθα,
οἱ μὴ τοῖς σπατάλοις κλέμμασι τερπόμενοι.
ταῖς μὲν χρὼς ἀπόδωδε μύρου, σοβαρόν τε φρύαγμα,
καὶ μέχρι κινδύνου† ἑσπομένη τύνοδος·
ταῖς δὲ χάρις καὶ χρὼς ἴδιος καὶ λέκτρον ἕτοιμον
†δώροις ἐκ σπατάλοις† οὐκ ἀλεγιζόμενον.
μιμοῦμαι Πύρρον τὸν Ἀχιλλέος, ὃς προέκρινεν
Ἑρμιόνης ἀλόχου τὴν λάτριν Ἀνδρομάχην.

δουλίδας. "The form is rare." Page does not observe its frequency in patristic Greek: *Testamentum Abrahae A* 15 (p. 95.18 James); Gregory of Nyssa, *V. Macr.* (*PG* 46.965D); Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 61 (*PG* 34.1233A) and elsewhere.

κλέμμασι. Page was hard pressed to find parallels for the amatory connotation of this noun. It might be instructive to compare the frequent use of *furtum* in Roman love poetry. This is not the only occasion where a Rufinian usage can be illuminated by Latin. Any such influence, if conceded, would of course argue for a late date for our poet.[6]

σοβαρόν. In his detailed account of this word (44–46), Page emphasises the rarity of its appearance in poetry before the *Cycle* of Agathias, noting that he could find no example even in Peek's *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. There is actually one in Kaibel, *EG* 1028.18, where Hermann's contention that the word is inappropriate to hair is refuted by pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 40.

σύνοδος. "This Aristotelian term for sexual intercourse is altogether avoided by the amatory poets before Rufinus; it may be significant that its only other appearance in verse is in the *Cycle*." Its appearance in pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 38, between a pastiche of Hesiod and a reference to Euripides, suggests the usage may have been commoner than this; that the word is a standard synonym for μίξις in patristic Greek is shown by Gregory of Nyssa, *Eun.* 6 (*PG* 45.737A).

6(5.19)

οὐκέτι παιδομανὴς ὡς πρίν ποτε, νῦν δὲ καλοῦμαι
θηλυμανής, καὶ νῦν δίσκος ἐμοὶ κρόταλον.
ἀντὶ δέ μοι παίδων ἀδόλου χροὸς ἥρεσε γύψου
χρώματα καὶ φύκους ἄνθος ἐπεισόδιον.
βοσκήσει δελφῖνας ὁ δενδροκόμης Ἐρύμανθος
καὶ πολιὸν πόντου κῦμα θοὰς ἐλάφους.

παιδομανὴς. Notice the cognate verb παιδομανέω, not in *LSJ*: Evagrius, *HE* 5.3 (p. 197.21 Bidez-Parmentier).

θηλυμανὴς. Page misquotes and misinterprets Alciphron 1.6.4, where the text is actually καὶ τοῦ λάγνος εἶναι καὶ θηλυμανὴς ἀπόσχου, and the meaning of the epithet identical to that in the present passage.

Page dismisses Paton's notion that in line 2 *latet spurci aliquid*. Yet there may be something in this. Sexual *double-entendres* are common enough in the poets of the Anthology; Page himself finds them elsewhere in Rufinus. Conceivably, the discus could symbolize a boy's bottom, the rattle the vagina. Such imagery would appear to lack parallel,[7] but it might be taken as a variant on the standard use of wrestling terminology in sexual contexts, an example of the originality of theme and treatment that Page finds throughout Rufinus, most pertinently in the *kondax* motif of poem 22.

[6]At the very least, it would put him in the imperial Roman period. For possible Latin influences on the language of Greek writers, see G. Williams, *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley 1978) 132–134; Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford 1970) 19–21.

[7]No sign of it, for notable instance, in Attic Comedy; cf. J. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven 1975) 169–170.

γύψου. Page could find no cosmetic use of this word. Its employment in a decorative context in Kaibel, *EG* 805, is worth noting, as are the various mentions of it as a decoration for the faces of initiates by Nonnus 6.169; 27.205; 29.274; 34.144 (once as part of a salve to heal a face-wound).

δενδροκόμης. Page seems right in claiming this as a *hapax*; note the cognate verb δενδροκομέω, Constantine Manasses, *Chron.* 7 (Boissonade), not in *LSJ* or Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*.

8(5.22)
σοί με λάτριν γλυκύδωρος Ἔρως παρέδωκε, Βοῶπι,
ταῦρον ὑποζεύξας εἰς πόθον αὐτόμολον,
αὐτοθελῆ, πάνδουλον, ἑκούσιον, αὐτοκέλευστον,
αἰτήσοντα πικρὴν μήποτ' ἐλευθερίην
ἄχρι φίλης πολιῆς καὶ γήραος. ὄμμα βάλοι δέ
μήποτ' ἐφ' ἡμετέραις ἐλπίσι βασκανίη.

Boopis. Page rightly hesitates over whether to call this a proper name or an epithet. If the former, it is apparently unique, as he says. One might compare *CIL* 6.1424, where an epitaph for the lady Gellia Agrippiniana includes in the address her pet names Glaucopis Venus.[8]

γλυκύδωρος. "Thrice in Bacchylides, not elsewhere." In point of fact, the word is used by Oppian, *Hal.* 4.105, and (of the Virgin Mary) by pseudo-Methodius, *Sym. et Ann.* 14 (*PG* 18.381B).

αὐτοθελῆ. "A very rare word." On the other hand, its presence in a notice of the *Suda* (K 2145 Adler) may imply regular usage in late Greek. Notice also the analogous forms αὐτοθέλημα and αὐτοθέλητος, not in *LSJ*: Epiphanius, *Haer.* 76.37 (*PG* 42.593C); Agathangelus, *V. Greg. Illustr.* 94.

αὐτοκέλευστον. "Xenophon and occasionally in prose thereafter." It is common in patristic prose and verse, for example Gregory Nazianzenus, *Carm.* 1.1.3.8 (*PG* 37.408A).

10(5.28)
νῦν μοι "χαῖρε" λέγεις, ὅτε σου τὸ πρόσωπον ἀπῆλθεν
κεῖνο τὸ τῆς λύγδου, βάσκανε, λειότερον·
νῦν μοι προσπαίζεις, ὅτε τὰς τρίχας ἠφάνικάς σου
τὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς σοβαροῖς αὐχέσι πλαζομένας.
μηκέτι μοι, μετέωρε, προσέρχεο μηδὲ συνάντα·
ἀντὶ ῥόδου γὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν βάτον οὐ δέχομαι.

βάσκανε. Page is uncertain whether the word here means "malicious" or "charmer." But μετέωρος (a distinctively Rufinian usage, as Page shows *à propos* poem 7) seems to rule out the latter. The adjective may be rare in the Anthology, but it is a common term for malicious demons in sepulchral epigram (Kaibel, *EG* 345, 379, 569, 734), also in patristic prose and verse, for instance Gregory Nazianzenus, *Carm.* 1.1.7.66 (*PG* 37.441A).

[8]Cf. App. 16 to Friedlaender's *Sittengeschichte Roms* (English version, London 1913) 4.87–88.

αὐχέσι. "The plural of one person's neck is very rare." But not in the case of Latin *cervices*, conceivably an influence here.

11(5.35)

πυγὰς αὐτὸς ἔκρινα τριῶν, εἵλοντο γὰρ αὐταί
δείξασαι γυμνῶν ἀστεροπὴν μελέων.
καί ῥ' ἡ μὲν τροχαλοῖς σφραγιζομένη γελασίνοις
λευκῇι ἀπὸ γλουτῶν ἤνθεεν εὐαφίηι,
τῆς δὲ διαιρομένης φοινίσσετο χιονέη σάρξ
πορφυρέοιο ῥόδου μᾶλλον ἐρυθροτέρη,
ἡ δὲ γαληνιόωσα χαράσσετο κύματι κωφῶι
αὐτομάτη τρυφερῶι χρωτὶ σαλευομένη.
εἰ ταύτας ὁ κριτὴς ὁ θεῶν ἐθεήσατο πυγάς,
οὐκέτ' ἂν οὐδ' ἐσιδεῖν ἤθελε τὰς προτέρας.

The theme of beauty competitions, which is also that of poem 12, is unique in the Anthology. Page rightly points to Alciphron 4.14 and Athenaeus 12.554C, where pygal charms are equally in cause. Add the very similar elaboration of theme and language in pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 14.

ἀστεροπὴν μελέων. "A striking phrase; the metaphor is more readily applied to the eyes." Compare Philostratus, *Ep. amat.* 34 (of a woman's *naked* charms): ἀστράπτειν τὰ ἔνδον.

καί ῥ'. Ῥα in such circumstances is said by Page to be very rare in the later epigrammatists. Nevertheless, the presence of ὅς ῥα in the "poems" of that most lamentable of scribblers, Dioscorus of Aphrodito,[9] practically guarantees their frequency in later Greek.

χιονέη. Add Nonnus 15.226 (χιονέων μελέων) and elsewhere, of parts of the body.

γαληνιόωσα. This form is also in Nonnus 33.143; 41.403 (both times of a woman's face).

12(5.36)

ἤρισαν ἀλλήλαις Ῥοδόπη Μελίτη Ῥοδόκλεια,
τῶν τρισσῶν τὶς ἔχει κρείσσονα μηριόνην,
καὶ με κριτὴν εἵλοντο· καὶ ὡς θεαὶ αἱ περίβλεπτοι
ἔστησαν γυμναί, νέκταρι λειβόμεναι.
καὶ Ῥοδόπης μὲν ἔλαμπε μέσος μηρῶν πολύτιμος
⟨ ⟩
⟨ ⟩
οἷα ῥοδὼν †πολιῶι† σχιζόμενος ζεφύρωι·
τῆς δὲ Ῥοδοκλείης ὑάλωι ἴσος, ὑγρομέτωπος,
οἷα καὶ ἐν νηῶι πρωτογλυφὲς ξόανον.
ἀλλὰ σαφῶς ἃ πέπονθε Πάρις διὰ τὴν κρίσιν εἰδώς
τὰς τρεῖς ἀθανάτας εὐθὺ συνεστεφάνουν.

Rhodocleia. If Page is right, as he seems to be, in denoting this name as a very rare one (elsewhere only in epigrams 27–28 [*AP* 5.73–74] and

[9]2.22; 5.10 (identical lines): ed. E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Göttingen 1963).

Leontius Scholasticus, *AP* 16.283), then Averil Cameron's[10] description of it as a stock name requires modification.

μηριόνην. "Here only = *feminal*." The term, with its etymology, is given by Sextus Empiricus, *Hyp. Pyrr.* 3.199.

πολύτιμος. Page rightly takes this to be an adjective rather than (as Waltz and Beckby) a noun, calling it a very rare one. Rare enough, he might have added, for Paton to conjecture Πολύφημος in its place. Page himself gives no other example of the word; *LSJ* cite only Babrius and Polybius; it was plausibly restored in Kaibel, *EG* 1027.30; patristic Greek yields further examples: Clement, *Paid.* 2.1 (*PG* 8.393A); Hippolytus, *Haer.* 5.9 (*PG* 16.3158C).

σχιζόμενος. Page found a cutting wind to be natural idiom but hard to parallel (he offers none) in Greek. Two disparate authors attest to the existence of the basic metaphor: Theocritus 22.15–16: θάλασσα κοπτομένη πνοιαῖς; Alciphron 3.42: ὁ βορρᾶς δίεισί μου τῶν πλευρῶν ὥσπερ βέλος.

13(5.37) μήτ' ἰσχνὴν λίην περιλάμβανε μήτε παχεῖαν,
τούτων δ' ἀμφοτέρων τὴν μεσότητα θέλε.
τῆι μὲν γὰρ λείπει σαρκῶν χύσις, ἡ δὲ περισσὴν
κέκτηται· λεῖπον μὴ θέλε μηδὲ πλέον.

For this variation on a common theme, add the strikingly close parallel in pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 14, to Page's examples from Martial and Alciphron.

χύσις. Page, following *LSJ*, signals this word in the sense of "abundance" as unique to Rufinus. But it is a common usage in patristic Greek, which no doubt is why Nonnus, *Par. Jo.* 6.15, employs it of an abundance of bread.

14(5.41) τίς γυμνὴν οὕτω σε καὶ ἐξέβαλεν καὶ ἔδειρεν;
τίς ψυχὴν λιθίνην εἶχε καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπεν;
μοιχὸν ἴσως ηὗρηκεν ἀκαίρως κεῖνος ἐσελθών·
γινόμενον· πᾶσαι τοῦτο ποοῦσι, τέκνον.
πλὴν ἀπὸ νῦν, ὅταν ἐστὶν ἔσω, κεῖνος δ' ὅταν ἔξω,
τὸ πρόθυρον σφήνου, μὴ πάλι ταὐτὸ πάθηις.

ἀκαίρως. To eliminate the metrical irregularity, Page conjectured adverbial ἀκαίρια, adducing ἀκαίριος ἥκεις from Peek, *GV* 1571.11 Extra support for this notion is to hand from the presence of the same phrase (a metrically convenient formula) in *Etymologicum Magnum* 810.20 (Gaisford)

ἀπὸ νῦν. Page could discover no exact parallel; observe the cognate ἀπὸ τότε in the *NT* (Matthew 4.17).

17(5.44) Λέμβιον, ἡ δ' ἑτέρα Κερκούριον, αἱ δύ' ἑταῖραι,
αἰὲν ἐφορμοῦσιν τῶι Σαμίων λιμένι.
ἀλλά, νέοι, πανδημὶ τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης
φεύγεθ'· ὁ συμμίξας καὶ καταδὺς πίεται.

[10] *Agathias* (Oxford 1970) 23.

The words *τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς 'Αφροδίτης φεύγεθ'* are lifted verbatim from the model poem, *AP* 5.161, a most unusual phenomenon according to Page, who adduces only the similar debt owed by *AP* 7.244 to *AP* 7.721. Add *AP* 16.337 and 357, in which the first lines and the opening of the second ones are identical.

18(5.47) *πολλάκις ἠρασάμην σε λαβὼν ἐν νυκτί, Θάλεια,*
πληρῶσαι θαλερῆι θυμὸν ἐρωμανίηι·
νῦν δ' ὅτε ⟨μοι⟩ γυμνὴ γλυκεροῖς μελέεσσι πέπλησαι,
ἔκλυτος ὑπναλέωι γυῖα κέκμηκα κόπωι.
θυμὲ τάλαν, τί πέπονθας; ἀνέγρεο μηδ' ἀπόκαμνε·
ζητήσεις ταύτην τὴν ὑπερευτυχίην.

Sexual inability occasioned by sleepiness rather than impotence is commended by Page as an original variation. The distinction might be thought rather subtle. In addition to the impotence poems listed by Page, of which Ovid *Am.* 3.7 is strikingly close in some of its language to Rufinus, notice the late Latin poet Maximianus 5.81 f. and (indicating the subject's persistence) the much later Marbodus, *De Matrona* 1602 (*PL* 171.170D). Petronius 87, where Eumolpus is eventually too sleepy to make *more* love, provides a gloss on the treatment of the theme.

θυμὲ. "Presumably stands for *membrum virile.*" The fact that poems involving sexual failure, from Ovid to Maximianus, almost always include apostrophisation of the delinquent organ makes this interpretation well-nigh irresistible.[11]

Thaleia. Included in Page's list of very rare names, with one inscriptional example and one in Agathias. Further evidence is provided by *CIG* 6588; *SEG* 19 (1963) 354; *CIL* 9.2472 (*ILS* 6519), a slave girl.

21(5.60) *παρθένος ἀργυρόπεζος ἐλούετο, χρύσεα μαζῶν*
χρωτὶ γαλακτοπαγεῖ μῆλα διαινομένη·
πυγαὶ δ' ἀλλήλαις περιηγέες εἱλίσσοντο
ὕδατος ὑγροτέρωι χρωτὶ σαλευόμεναι·
τὸν δ' ὑπεροιδαίνοντα κατέσκεπε πεπταμένη χείρ
οὐχ ὅλον Εὐρώταν ἀλλ' ὅσον ἠδύνατο.

I have written at length on the interpretation of this poem (*JHS* 100 [1980] 182–184); two salient linguistic points are here recapitulated.

ἀργυρόπεζος. "Only here in this form." In fact, Pollux 2.192 registers it as an epithet of Thetis.

ὑπεροιδαίνοντα. "Here only." But Gregory of Nyssa twice uses it, once metaphorically of the human heart: *PG* 45.676B; 46.609B.

22(5.61) *τῆι κυανοβλεφάρωι παίζων κόνδακα Φιλίππηι*
ἐξ αὐτῆς κραδίης ἠδὺ γελᾶν ἐπόουν·
"δώδεκά σοι βέβληκα, καὶ αὔριον ἄλλα βαλῶ σοι
ἢ πλέον ἠὲ πάλιν δώδεκ' ἐπιστάμενος."
εἶπα, κελευομένη ⟨δ'⟩ ἦλθεν· γελάσας δὲ πρὸς αὐτήν
"εἴθε σε καὶ νύκτωρ ἐγρομένην ἐκάλουν."

[11]On this point, see the review by D. A. Campbell, *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 368.

Page, after Hecker, correctly sees this poem as a sustained sexual joke, unlike Paton who found it "quite unintelligible." Rufinus is combining two motifs: sexual braggadocio and sporting metaphor for intercourse; cf. Lucian (?), *Asinus* 5–6.

κυανοβλεφάρωι. Page seems right in calling this a *hapax*, adducing the Theocritean κυάνοφρυς as a parallel. Add κυανοβόστρυχος, not in *LSJ*, from Methodius (*PG* 18.212D).

23(5.62) οὔ πω σοι τὸ καλὸν χρόνος ἔσβεσεν, ἀλλ' ἔτι πολλά
λείψανα τῆς προτέρης σώιζεται ἡλικίης,
καὶ Χάριτες μίμνουσιν ἀγήραοι, οὐδὲ τὸ καλὸν
τῶν ἱλαρῶν μήλων ἢ ῥόδον ἐξέφυγεν.
ὦ πόσσους κατέφλεξε τὸ πρὶν θεοείκελον †κάλλος†
⟨ ⟩

ἱλαρῶν μήλων. Observing that "merry breasts is not a credible expression," Page insists that μῆλα must be cheeks. But if a Roman poet could write *maestos sinus* (Tibullus 1.3.6),[12] why could not a Greek one talk about merry breasts? An alternative not noticed by Page would be to translate the adjective as "shining," a meaning (as applied to gold) attested in papyri.[13]

θεοείκελον. Page merely notes the rarity of this word in the Anthology. Its frequency in later Greek is confirmed by such diverse texts as Lucian, *Pro Imag.* 25; Kaibel, *EG* 866; Dioscorus of Aphrodito 4.3.

25(5.69) Παλλὰς ἐσαθρήσασα καὶ Ἥρη χρυσοπέδιλος
Μαιονίδ' ἐκ κραδίης ἴαχον ἀμφότεραι
"οὐκέτι γυμνούμεσθα· κρίσις μία ποιμένος ἀρκεῖ·
οὐ καλὸν ἡττᾶσθαι δὶς περὶ καλλοσύνης."

Maionis. Unique here as a proper name. Maionia, nurse of Bacchus, in Nonnus 25.451, might have been noticed.

27(5.73) δαίμονες, οὐκ ἤιδειν ὅτι λούεται ⟨ἡ⟩ Κυθέρεια
χερσὶ καταυχενίους λυσαμένη πλοκάμους.
ἱλήκοις, δέσποινα, καὶ ὄμμασιν ἡμετέροισι
μήποτε μηνίσηις θεῖον ἰδοῦσι τύπον.
νῦν ἔγνων. Ῥοδόκλεια, καὶ οὐ Κύπρις· εἶτα τὸ κάλλος
τοῦτο πόθεν; σύ, δοκῶ, τὴν θεὸν ἐκδέδυκας.

καταυχενίους. Claimed as a *hapax* by Page. It can be found in patristic prose: Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 12 (*PG* 25.708A); *Martyrium Tarachi*, 1.

29(5.75) γείτονα παρθένον εἶχον Ἀμυμώνην, Ἀφροδίτη,
ἥ μου τὴν ψυχὴν ἔφλεγεν οὐκ ὀλίγον.
αὐτή μοι προσέπαιζε, καὶ εἴ ποτε καιρὸς ἐτόλμων·
ἠρυθρία· τί πλέον; τὸν πόνον ἡσθάνετο.
ἤνυσα πολλὰ καμών. παρακήκοα νῦν ὅτι τίκτει.
ὥστε τί ποιοῦμεν; φεύγομεν ἢ μένομεν;

[12]Cf. F. Cairns, *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979) 104.
[13]Cf. L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* (London 1945) 40.

Amymone. "The name elsewhere only of the well-known mythological lady." A real-life one is celebrated in *CIL* 6.11602 (*ILS* 8402); Buecheler (*CE* 603) restored another to *CIL* 6.9810 (*ILS* 7477).

ἤνυσα. Page adduces only *AP* 5.275 (Paulus Silentiarius) for this verb in an erotic context; there is an equally good example in *AP* 5.55 (Dioscorides).[14]

πολλὰ καμών. Add Nonnus 25.197 (his only use of the present participle of this verb). The metrically convenient pair of words is clearly a pat formula.

McCail criticises Page for not glossing the use of the indicative for the sujunctive in the deliberative question of the last line, adding his own parallel from the *NT*. Euripides, *Andr.* 1036 πῶς πείθομαι furnishes one example. And it is frequent in Latin: Cicero, *Ad Att.* 13.40.2 *advolone an maneo?* is strikingly similar to Rufinus here; cf. Virgil *Ecl.* 8.108 *credimus?* Catullus, 1. 1 *cui dono . . . ?* (with Fordyce's note).

30(5.76)

αὕτη πρόσθεν ἔην ἐρατόχροος εἰαρόμασθος
εὔσφυρος εὐμήκης εὔοφρυς εὐπλόκαμος·
ἠλλάχθη δὲ χρόνωι καὶ γήραϊ καὶ πολιῆισι,
καὶ νῦν τῶν προτέρων οὐδ' ὄναρ οὐδὲν ἔχει,
ἀλλοτρίας δὲ τρίχας καὶ ῥυσῶδες ⟨τὸ⟩ πρόσωπον,
οἷον γηράσας οὐδὲ πίθηκος, ἔχει.

ἐρατόχροος. "Here only." Gregory Nazianzenus has it once: *Carm.* 1.2.2.264 (*PG* 37.627A); cf. ἐρατωπός, not in *LSJ*, *Orac. Sib.* 11.84.

εὔοφρυς. "Elsewhere only Philostratus, *Her.* 19. 9." Malalas has it in two of his identikit descriptions of Homeric characters: 5.91 (p. 113 Bonn); 5.106 (p. 133 Bonn). Also in Constantine Manasses, *Chron.* 1157.

34(5.93)

ὅπλισμαι πρὸς Ἔρωτα περὶ στέρνοισι λογισμόν,
οὐδέ με νικήσει μοῦνος ἐὼν πρὸς ἕνα.
θνατὸς δ' ἀθανάτωι συστήσομαι. ἦν δὲ βοηθόν
Βάκχον ἔχηι, τί μόνος πρὸς δύ' ἐγὼ δύναμαι;

βοηθόν. Page could only find Peek, *GV* 1118.1, for another verse example. Dioscorus of Aphrodito, who can rarely be accused of originality, has it twice (3.73, 82). It is also common in patristic Greek.

36(5.97)

εἰ μὲν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροισιν, Ἔρως, ἴσα τόξα τιταίνεις,
εἶ θεός· εἰ δὲ ῥέπεις πρὸς μέρος, οὐ θεὸς εἶ.

πρὸς μέρος. As McCail (advancing no solution of his own) notes, Page might have commented on the very unusual meaning ("to one side") of this phrase, by contrast with its sense ("in proportion") in Thucydides and Demosthenes. For this noun in the sense of "side," cf. Hermas, *Vis. Past.* 3.2.1; *Const. Apost.* 5.14.15.

[14]This epigram is analysed by O. J. Schrier, "Love with Doris," *Mnemosyne* 32 (1979) 307–326.

The monosyllabic ending to the pentameter is not so rare as Page asserts. In adition to his ten examples from the Anthology, I have come across the following: 6.340, 341; 7.129, 626, 661; 8.166; 9.257, 367, 384; 11.114, 142, 218, 415; 12.13, 75, 151; 16.19a (*νιν*, as in Athenaeus 10.412F, cited by Page). And from Kaibel, *EG*: 111, 218 (*bis*), 315, 476, 558, 622, 640, 651.

37(5.103) *μέχρι τίνος*, Προδίκη, *παρακλαύσομαι*; *ἄχρι τινος σε*
γουνάσομαι, *στερεή*, *μηδὲν ἀκουόμενος*;
ἤδη καὶ λευκαί σοι ἐπισκιρτῶσιν ἔθειραι,
καὶ τάχα μοι δώσεις ὡς Ἑκάβῃ Πριάμωι.

ἐπισκιρτῶσιν. "A very rare compound." But a favourite with Nonnus, who uses it twenty times.

In brief conclusion, most of Rufinus' seemingly rare or unique diction finds a parallel in late Greek, with Latin usage occasionally an extra possible influence. All of which seems to me strongly to reinforce Page's late dating.

XII

NOTES ON THE LANGUAGE OF GREEK EPIGRAMS

Denys Page's posthumously published *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981, thanks to R.D. Dawe and J. Diggle) is as indispensable as its predecessors. But the magisterial style should not blind us to the fact that it contains a certain amount of linguistic misinformation. Correcting this is no idle display of captious pedantry. Decisions about authorship and date, not to mention text, are often made on the basis of vocabulary, thus requiring that statistics be as full and accurate as possible. Hence these notes, offered as friendly supplement, with the pleasant bonus of providing some information for colleagues in the field.

In what follows, Page is abbreviated to P, with all unattributed quotations representing his own words. Enumeration follows his page numbers along with parenthetic reference to source and authorship of the poem in question. Unless otherwise specified, they come from the Anthology.

9 (P. Oxy. 4. 662, Amyntes): ἄσκεπος. "Elsewhere only Lucian, *Philopatr.* 21." Lucian, however, did not write the *Philopatris* (cf. B. Baldwin, *YCS* 27 (1982) 321–44), hence this is to give the word a classicising respectability to which it is not entitled. There is a possible occurrence (the text is disputed) in the Suda (A 4413 Adler) in a passage deriving from Preger, *Script. Orig. Const.*, 158.

16 (9. 321, Antimachus): εὐχαίτης. "Rare before Nonnus; first in Callimachus." The epithet can also be seen in *AP* 4. 1. 51, the preface to Meleager's Garland. Mesomedes has it (2. 6 in E. Heitsch, *Die Griechischen Dichterfragmente der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, Göttingen 1963, 1. 25 — hereafter cited simply as Heitsch); so does *Orac. Syb.* 14. 138. Furthermore, its presence in *AP* 9. 524, an anonymous list of the epithets of Dionysus, implies that it was commonplace.

18 (11. 275, Apollonius of Rhodes?): ξύλινος νοῦς. P found no Greek parallel for 'wooden' in the sense of 'stupid'. But the Byzantine critic Tzetzes, in the course of his iambic diatribe at the end of the scholia to Thucydides, applies the phrase ξυλώδει τοῦ λόγου to the style of that historian. In another versified scholium (Hude 297), he has the cognate περίξυλον λόγου. The human soul is once called wooden by the fifth or sixth century writer Oecumius (*Apoc.* 8. 7).

29 (Athenaeus 509b, Archimelus): ἐπωμίς. "Not a nautical term, and there is no knowing what this author may have meant by a ship's shoulder." Gulick in the Loeb translates as 'prow', which is where the picture of Isis was painted on the ship of that name in Lucian, *Navig.* 5, hence suiting the present, similar description by Archimelus. The word is used metaphorically of the flanks of a door by Theodoret, *Ezech.* 40: 47–9.

35 (9. 4, Cyllenius): θηροβότος. "Elsewhere only in the letters of Phalaris." Nonnus has it once: *Dion.* 16, 259.

36 (same poem): φυτοεργός. P asserts that this form is elsewhere only in Dionysius Periegetes. But Nonnus has it three times: *Dion.* 47. 58, 70, 125. Notice also the cognate noun φυτοεργείη (not in *LSJ*) in a poem by Gregory Nazianzenus (*PG* 37. 542a).

38 (16. 180, Democritus): ἁλιμυρής. P calls this very rare, adducing only Peek 1833. 5 and Oppian, *Hal.* 2. 258: πέτρης ἁλιμυρέος. Oppian's phrase, however, is filched directly from Apollonius of Rhodes 1. 913; the epithet is also in Tryphiodorus 684.

45 (5. 82, Dionysius Sophista): σοβαρός. P here gives the gist of the discussion in his earlier *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge, 1978), 44–6, where he emphasises the rarity of its appearance in poetry before the *Cycle* of Agathias, noting that he could find no example even in Peek's *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. There is actually one in Kaibel, *EG* 1028. 18, where Hermann's objection to the reading is refuted by pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 40.

46 (Athenaeus 412f, Dorieus): ἄζυγος. "Very rare, and elsewhere relatively late." Late, yes, but very common in patristic writers: Hippolytus, *Haer.* 6. 29 (*PG* 16. 3253c); Theodoret, *Ps.* 57: 6; Sophronius, *Ep. Syn.* (*PG* 87. 3153a); Methodius, *Symp.* 5.2 (*PG* 18. 97c); and elsewhere. Cf. Kaibel, *EG* 1035. 1.

This poem also displays νιν at the end of a pentameter, which P claims to be without parallel, adding the contention from his *Epigrams of Rufinus* (102) that all such monosyllabic endings are rare. Yet νιν concludes a pentameter in the epigram of Herodicus printed by P himself, 63. For monosyllabic endings in general, add to P's own ten examples from the Anthology the following: 6. 340, 341; 7. 129, 626, 661; 8. 166; 9. 257, 367, 384; 11. 114, 142, 218, 415; 12. 75, 151. and from Kaibel, *EG*: 111, 218 (*bis*), 315, 476, 558, 622, 640, 651.

48 (6. 165, Flaccus?): κωνοφόρος. Only in Theophrastus, according to P. It is worth noticing that Hesychius registers the term, glossing it as στροβιλοφόρος.

58 (7. 275, Gaetulicus): δύσπλοος. P dubs this a new compound; neither he nor *LSJ* gives any other example. One is provided by a patristic author: Epiphanius, *Haer.* 37. 9 (*PG* 41. 653b).

60 (11. 409, Gaetulicus): οἰνοπέδης. Calling this a *hapax legomenon*, P wonders if it should be altered to the normal neuter. Needlessly; the form is certified by Oppian, *Cyn.* 4. 331.

64 (Athenaeus 222a, Herodicus): δυσπέμφελος. A rarity, claims P, adducing only Homer, Hesiod, and unspecified occasional appearances in much later authors. That the word enjoyed a continuous history, or at least a large-scale revival in late poetry, may be hinted at by its four occurrences in Nonnus: *Dion.* 2. 550; 13. 75; 22. 171; 24. 64.

67 (Athenaeus 343e–f, Juba Rex): χρυσολόβος. "Not elsewhere." Indeed, only here by courtesy of Porson's conjecture!

69 (6. 191, Cornelius Longus): ἀφυλίζω. "Here only." The verb recurs in Methodius, *Symp.* 6. 4 (*PG* 18. 120a).

73 (9. 360, Metrodorus): εὐσεβής. Here meaning 'venerable', uniquely according to P. The word becomes regular in this sense in Byzantine Greek, applied thus to emperors living and dead and to their appurtenances.

90 (10. 6, Satyrus): ἀνθοκόμος. Only here and in Oppian, remarks P. But it is frequent in Nonnus, for instance *Dion.* 7. 194. There is a further case in pseudo-Chrysostom, *Nat. Christ.* 2, and a possible (the text is doubtful) one in Apollinarius, *Met. Ps.* 76: 19 (*PG* 33. 1421d).

93 (16. 153, Satyrus): ἀντίθροος. "Coluthus 119; the word not elsewhere until much later." A doubly misleading remark, since the epithet is in Nonnus, *Dion.* 13. 414.

105 (6. 183, Zosimus): ἰχνελάτης. Denoted by P as a hapax legomenon. However, it appears in *AP* 16. 289 (anon.). For the cognate ἰχνηλάτης, P gives only an unspecified allusion to Plutarch; the form occurs in John Nicaenus, *Nativ.* (*PG* 96. 1440c).

106 (6. 185, Zosimus): ἄπλωτος. P (though not Beckby or Paton) accepts this emendation by Lobeck, albeit concerned that it results in a *hapax legomenon*, one overlooked by *LSJ*. In point of fact, the word is to be found in *Miracula Artemii* 45.

109 (9. 496, Athenaeus): εἰδήμων. P calls this a very rare word, adducing only the anonymous *AP* 9. 505. Diogenes Laertius 6. 14 furnishes an example. Earlier editions of Liddell & Scott supply no references to back up their claim that it is an ecclesiastical term; nor is it registered in the lexica of Lampe & Sophocles. Stephanus, however, illustrates it from such authors as Eusebius and Clement of Alexandria.

149 (Athenaeus 594d, Archilochus?): κορώνη. "I know of no example of κορώνη equivalent to *membrum virile*, but should not be surprised if that is the meaning here." This sense of the noun is attested by the Suda (K 2105 Adler), transcribing Artemidorus 5. 65; cf. G. Wills, *CQ* N.S. 20 (1970), 112; J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven, 1975), 20.

This poem also contains the noun δέκτρια, claimed by P to be elsewhere only in *AP* 11. 400 (Lucian), thus overlooking its presence in a poem of Gregory Nazianzenus (*PG* 37. 783a).

180 (9. 826, Plato?): ὁμέψιος. "Here only." Nonnus has it more than once: *Dion.* 10. 193, 282; 11. 2; 33. 66.

Also here is μέθυος, which P calls an extremely rare genitive, adducing only Nicander, *Ther.* 582. But its presence is such humdrum works as Marcellus Sidetes, *De Pisc.* 50 (Heitsch 2, 19) and the anonymous *carmen de viribus herbarum* 98 (Heitsch 2, 30) may argue for a greater frequency.

252 (13. 26, Simonides?): ἀπέκγονος. Not unique here, as P; see Constantine Manasses, *Chron.* 440 (*PG* 127. 237a).

315 (5. 64, anon.): ἀσύγκριτος. P calls this a rare word, also expressing concern over its meanings of 'incomparable' and 'different'. Apart from its ubiquity in patristic prose, the epithet is worth noticing as a favourite of Plutarch in his formal comparisons of great men, as for instance *Pericles & Fabius* 3; *Lysander & Sulla* 4.

331 (7. 544, anon.): εὐάμπελος. Very rare, says P, citing only Strabo, Pollux, and *AP* 9. 524, the aforementioned inventory of epithets for Dionysus. Its presence in this last may suggest common use. P overlooks the four appearances

of the word in Nonnus: *Dion.* 12. 300; 16. 275; 34. 214; 43. 54. Add the patristic example of Cyril, *Ador.* 5.

336 (7, 10, anon.): εὐφόρμιξ. Add Nonnus, *Par. Jo.* 15: 25 (*PG* 43. 877a) to P's two illustrations of this "surprisingly rare compound."

347 (7. 12, anon.): λινόκλωστος. "Here only." There is one Byzantine example in Theodore Prodromos, p. 162 Eberling.

354 (7. 321, anon.): ἀνθοκομεῖν. Not only here, as P; the verb recurs in patristic Greek: Cyril, *Jo.* 4. 4; pseudo-Chrysostom, *Pasch.* 6. 3.

363 (9. 32, anon.): λοίγιος. "Homeric, and rare thereafter." Apart from its frequency in Nonnus, notice Andromachus, *Ther.* 91 (Heitsch 2, 11).

367 (9. 159, anon.): κατοιχόμενος. P regards this participle in the sense of 'dead' as a rare use of a rare verb. Yet Hesychius (s.v.) thought it worth registering, and there are such patristic examples as Gregory of Nyssa, *Virg.* 3 (*PG* 46. 333a); Cyril, *Ador.* 14; Theodoret, *Quaest. Secund. in Ruth* 1. 351.

377 (*CIG* 3797 = Kaibel, *EG* 779, anon.): εὐάντητος. P describes this epithet as very rare, adducing only a single inscription. Nonnus has it thrice: *Dion.* 27. 178; 35. 316; 39. 207; for an earlier case, cf. the anonymous Hymn to Hecate (Heitsch 1, 171, l. 8).

383 (16. 12, anon.): μελισταγής. P's note implies rarity. In fact, it is common, as one might suppose from its appearances in the lame formulas of Dioscorus of Aphrodito 6. 1; 8. 8 (Heitsch 1, 136, 138). It is frequent in Nonnus, also in patristic prose and verse, one example being furnished by a poem of Gregory Nazianzenus (*PG* 37. 684a); cf. Kaibel, *EG* 1073. 3.

383 (9. 142, anon.): κρημνοβάτης. Not only here, as P; it features in a poem of Gregory Nazianzenus (*PG* 37. 1267a).

408 (*Schol. Ar. Ach.* 214, anon.): the well known epigram on the long jump of Phayllus. P rightly derides those who admire the alliterative first line where four of the six words begin with a π. There are parallel efforts equally banal, in *AP* 6. 216 and in Heitsch 1, 51.

431 (Steph. Byz., anon.): ἡνίοχος. Add to P's mainly epigraphic parallels for the figurative use of this word Aristides 5 (Heitsch 2, 42): μύθων ἀενάων κύδιμος ἡνίοχος.

481 (Plutarch, *Cato min.* 1, anon.): γλαυκόμματος. P adduces only Plato, *Phaedr.* 253e, for this compound; it occurs in a fragment (Heitsch 2, 47) of the poet Pisander.

486 (P. Lit. Lond. 62, anon.): νίκαιος. "A very rare adjective, mostly an epithet of gods." Notice Nonnus, *Dion.* 18, 169, applying it to (unpersonified) hope.

Also in this poem in πρυτάνευμα, a noun P calls unique. Older editions of Liddell & Scott say it is Byzantine, but give no example; neither does the lexicon of Sophocles. The place to look is Theophylact Simocatta, *Hist.* 4. 4. 8 de Boor.

516 (6. 324, Leonides): ἀναίμακτος. P calls this a rare word, adducing only two examples from tragedy. It can be seen in Andromachus, *Ther.* 17 (Heitsch 2, 8), and is frequent in patristic authors.

527 (9. 345, Leonides): Ἰταλίδης. Registered by P as unique, but see *Orac. Syb.* 4. 104.

531 (9. 349, Leonides): ἐπιβλύζειν. P could find no other example of this compound, overlooking its presence in a poem of Gregory Nazianzenus (*PG* 37. 651a).

549 (9. 370, Tiberius Ilus): δικτυβόλων παγίδες. "Both words are very rare in the Anthology." Yet the first of them is not hard to come by in the dedicatory poems of Book Six (4, 105; cf. 186 for the cognate verb), whilst the latter is frequent: 5. 56 (coupled with δήκτυα); 6. 5, 109; 9. 152; cf. Kaibel, *EG* 421. 4.

551 (9. 372, Tiberius Ilus): φιλάοιδος. P asserts that this epithet is elsewhere only in Theocritus and Antipater, a claim that neglects Nonnus, *Dion.* 1. 415.

552 (9. 373, Tiberius Ilus): παροδῖτις. P is right to call this a very rare form, but not in imputing the same rarity to the cognate παροδίτης, which is ubiquitous: *AP* 8. 206 (Gregory Nazianzenus); *SEG* 3. 543; Kaibel, *EG* 111, 195, 231, 288, 336, 350.

555 (9. 376, Tiberius Ilus): θαλασσοπόρος. P. maintains the extreme rarity of this epithet, citing only Musaeus and Theaetetus Scholasticus. It is not that uncommon in late poetry, showing up four times in Nonnus (*Dion.* 20. 376; 21. 187; 40. 531; 43. 425) and once in Paulus Silentiarius, *Descr. S. Soph.* 907. Cf. the cognate noun θαλασσοπορία, absent from *LSJ*, in a scholium of Cosmas Melodus on the poems of Gregory Nazianzenus (*PG* 38. 349).

EROTICA

XIII

AQUATIC SEX

Housman, in his celebrated 'Praefanda' (*Hermes* 66[1931], 411 = *Classical papers* 3, 1972, 1183), took the verb *natare*, in two Suetonius passages describing imperial sex lives (*Tib.*44.1; *Dom.*22) to refer to some complicated group eroticism comparable to swimming.

This is possibly correct. If so, lexical entries for the verb have been deficient. The erotic nuance is not acknowledged in Lewis & Short, nor by the *Oxford Latin dictionary*. And there is no hint of it in P. Pierrugues, *Glossarium eroticum linguae Latinae*, Paris 1826, or R.Pichon, *Index verborum amatorium*, Paris 1902. In Greek, the verb συννήχεσθαι apparently connotes sexual intercourse in Aristophanes, *Eq.*1104; cf. J.Henderson, *The maculate Muse*, New Haven 1975, 164.

Also, it might have some bearing on that rather strange passage in Suetonius, *Cal.*54.2, where a register of the imperial histrionic and dancing talents is terminated by the abrupt remark *atque hic tam docilis ad cetera natare nesciit*. The biographer is perhaps making an anticlimactic joke, or else he misunderstood the full force of *natare* in a source, and included the item in a wrong context.

Housman could only advance *HA*, *Elag.*31.7, for further evidence on aquatic sex: *in balneis semper cum mulieribus fuit, ita ut eas psilothro curaret* (perhaps inspired by Suetonius, *Dom.*22). More recently, Alan Cameron pointed (*BICS* 20[1973], 149) to the closing lines of Martial 11.21:

hanc in piscina dicor futuisse marina
nescio; piscinam me futuisse puto.

To this he might have added the same poet's instructive variant on the theme in 4.22. Here, a blushing bride named Cleopatra takes refuge from her husband's embraces on the honeymoon night by hiding in the waters of a *lacus*. He finds her, and kisses her, but the action goes no further:

perspicuae plus vetuistis aquae.

Aqua-sex is also the theme of a poem by Luxorius, writing in Vandal Africa in the early 6th century (no.82 in the edition of M.Rosenblum, *Luxorius: a Latin poet among the Vandals*, New York 1961). It begins:

quidam concubitu futuit fervente Marinam;
fluctibus in salsis fecit adulterium.

The lady's name is suspiciously appropriate. Since Martial is the major literary influence on Luxorius, the poem can be seen as a re-working of 11.22. The concluding lines of the quatrain,

non hic culpandus, potius sed laude ferendus,
qui memor est Veneris quod mare nata foret,

stress the obvious inspiration for sex in the water as something of a poetic commonplace. Indeed, it is not impossible that a poet who called his heroine Marina in this context is punning on *natare* and its sexual implications in the phrase *mare nata*.

XIV

CIL IV 6892

This article examines the text and meaning of an anonymous epigram from Pompeii, with particular attention to the problem of what the word *mora* here means. Earlier explanations of the poem by Wick, Zangemeister, and Zottoli are discussed and found wanting. Various new possibilities are canvassed, with preference given to any one of several erotic interpretations.

quisquis amat nigras nigris carbonibus ardet;
Nigram cum uideo mora libenter edo.

This inscription has been several times translated, rarely discussed, and never explained. Some possibilities were explored by G. Zottoli in an article written more than seventy years ago [1]. Recently, F. M. Snowden adduced the poem in a discussion of black women in Greece and Rome; he called it puzzling, cited only Zottoli, and left it at that [2]. There seems to be nothing else. The present paper provides an analysis of the language, surveys the theories of Zottoli, and offers some new suggestions.

The text is not beyond dispute. In the first line, *nigras* has been read as *nigram*, and vice versa with *nigram* in the second. And in one or both cases, *nigram* has been read as the proper name Nigram [3]. Certitude is obviously impossible. In my opinion, the epigrammatic

---

1 G. Zottoli, «Lusus Pompeianus», *Atene e Roma* 11, 1908, pp. 357-60.

2 *Blacks in Antiquity*, Harvard 1970, p. 328, n. 149.

3 *Nigram* is read in both lines by M. Della Corte, *Loves and Lovers in Ancient Pompeii*, Naples 1960, p. 62, and by M. D'Avino, *The Women of Pompeii*, Naples 1967, p. 60. Zottoli declared himself indifferent to the question. Snowden cites all the above without comment or commitment. It should be observed that Nigra is not all that common a name; it is absent from (e. g.) Forcellini's *Onomasticon*; D. C. Swanson, *The Names in Roman Verse*, Wisconsin 1967; and the index to *CIL* IV (!). I. Kajanto, *Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, p. 228, notes 6 unspecified occurrences, 5 in *CIL* VIII (2231, 3930, 16404, 16747, 19159 — I add these references for the reader's sake), and the sixth presumably the present one.

nature of the poem demands a pointed contrast between dark girls in general and one in particular. Also, the plural *nigras* may go more happily with the following *nigris*. Hence the text as given above.

Wick[4] held that the graffito had a magical purpose: «non solum candidas puellas se praeferre, sed nigras omnino timere et adversus eas mora edere solere tamquam amuletum fassus est». This view of the writer's intent was dismissed by Zangemeister (the *CIL* editor) as an example of *ineptiae*. But Zangemeister offered no discussion, and did not himself venture beyond the limp conclusion that «mora memorat scriptor quia nigra sunt».

Zottoli rejected the magical interpretation on the grounds that such a practice is nowhere else attested. An eminently reasonable point, although it overlooks the possibility of a piece of local folklore, or even a personal superstition on the part of the writer.

Noting from a passage of Serenus Sammonicus[5] that *carbo* can mean *carbunculus*, Zottoli toyed with the idea of a medical explanation. When the writer sees a dark girl, he eats blackberries as an apotropaic. This is a possibility. Indeed, it can be enhanced by reference to the elder Pliny who recommended *mora* as a cure for diseases of the mouth[6]. Which in turn could comport the notion of infectious kisses.

Another proposition advanced by Zottoli is that *nigram* in the first line stands for *mala* or *perfida*: girls in general are bad. Then, a punning contrast provides a special girl (*nigram* or *Nigram*) whom the writer can happily love.

Zottoli himself plumped for an explanation whereby the hexameter sets down a blanket statement about dark girls, with *carbonibus* hinting at the proverbial *carbonem pro thesauro inuenire*[7]. In the pentameter, the exceptional quality of Nigra inspires the writer to love, however unwillingly.

The thought would be consonant with that of *CIL* IV 1520: *Candida me docuit nigras odisse puellas / odero si potero: si non, inuitus amabo.* This Propertian parody, it may be noted, is frequently encountered on the walls of Pompeii[8]. And a patent Catullan overtone of *odi et amo* can easily be subjoined.

---

4 F. C. Wick, «Vindiciae carminum Pompeianorum», *Atti d. R. Acc. d. Arch. Lett. e B. Arti di Napoli* 26, 1908, p. 27.

5 *Horrendum magis est perimit quod corpora carbo* (text in Baehrens, *FPR* 3, 120).

6 *NH* XXIV 120; cf. XXIV 117 for *mora* as a remedy against *scorpiones*.

7 Phaedrus V 6, 6.

8 *CIL* IV 1520, 1523, 1526, 1528, 1536.

An outburst against dark girls is all too plausible. There is respectable literary pedigree. It is sufficient to quote from an Ovidian catalogue of insults: *turgida, si plena est, si fusca est, nigra uocetur* [9].

With this in mind, a variant upon Zottoli's explanation may be proferred. *Carbo* can connote adverse criticism. Horace (*Serm.* II 3, 246) and Persius (V 108) are usually cited for this meaning. Plautus, however, provides the best and most pertinent example: *impleantur elegeorum meae fores carbonibus* (*Merc.* 409). Our writer is saying that the lover of dark girls incurs a black reputation. Nigra, by contrast, makes him change his mind. On this reckoning, *mora* is not the word for berries, but a latinised version of μῶρα, with something like *uerba* understood. For *edo* in the context of eating words, it is again Plautus who affords the parallel: *nimium libenter* (an adverb noticeable in the present discussion) *edi sermonem tuom* (*Aul.* 536). A Graecism in the vernacular of Pompeii will occasion no surprise. If, indeed, one has to call it that: Plautus uses the adjective at least three times in Latin dress [10].

This interpretation carries with it the advantage of ridding the poem of these perplexing berries. For readers who wish to retain them, other prospects will be found below. A general difficulty, as by now will be obvious, is whether to take the poem as amatory or satirical in tone. The opening phrase, for notable instance, is ubiquitous in Pompeian verses [11]. Perhaps the most relevant case is *CIL* IV 1898: *quisquis amat calidis non debet fontibus uti/nam nemo, flammis ustus, amare potest.* Is the graffito under discussion a sincere effort in this genre, or a parody thereof?

The problem posed by *mora* should not lead us to neglect the first line. For exactly what does *nigris carbonibus* mean? Various alternatives offer for those who do not fancy the explanation advanced earlier. It might simply be descriptive of the passions evoked by black women. Or pejorative. Logically, black coals ought to be cold ones which the charms of black girls are incapable of inflaming [12]. Dormant fires of love are a literary cliché, the most striking example being furnished by this epigram of Asclepiades (*AP* V 210) [13]:

---

[9] *Rem. Am.* 327; cf. Theocritus X 27 (with Gow's note).

[10] *Men.* 571; *Mil.* 370; *Trin.* 669.

[11] *CIL* IV 1824, 1898, 3199, 3200, 4091, 4200, 4659, 4663, 5186, 5272, 6782.

[12] I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. J. C. Yardley, for discussion of this point.

[13] On this epigram, ultimately deriving (in part) from Pindar, fr. 123 Snell, see W. Ludwig, «Kunst der Variation im Liebesepigramm», *L'Epigramme Grecque*, Fondation Hardt, Geneva 1968, p. 316, n. 2. For the fires of love in Greek poetry, see Gow on Theocritus XI 51.

Τῷ θαλλῷ Διδύμη με συνήρπασεν· ὦ μοι. ἐγὼ δὲ
τήκομαι, ὡς κηρὸς πὰρ πυρί, κάλλος ὁρῶν.
εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί τοῦτο; καὶ ἄνθρακες· ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐκείνους
θάλψωμεν, λάμπουσ' ὡς ῥόδεαι κάλυκες.

Or *nigris carbonibus* could be obscene. There is (unsurprisingly) no lack of vulgar language in the Pompeian graffiti [14]. Certainly, an obscene meaning can be found for *mora* without undue strain. It is a flexible term, equalling amongst other things the Greek συκάμινον, which in turn can stand for σῦκον. Now «fig» is used of the genitalia of either sex [15]. Furthermore, *edo* and compounds are frequent in sexual senses [16]. On this view, either the writer is attracted to Nigra and would like to practise cunnilingus upon her, or he is repelled and would rather devour his own organ, i. e. masturbate [17].

A final corollary. According to the *Suda* [18], one meaning of the verb συκοφαντεῖν is κνίζειν ἐρωτικῶς. So perhaps the writer of our graffito was employing *mora edo* as a Latin equivalent, complimenting Nigra on her ability to arouse him. This would involve a false scansion of the verb *edere*. Metrical error might be thought unlikely in one who seems to have been alive to at least some literary motifs [19]. Until, that is, we note that he was apparently unable to spell *edo*, whichever verb and meaning be in question [20].

---

14 The *index vocab.* to *CIL* IV furnishes many examples.

15 Notably in Aristophanes, *Pax* 1349-50; cf. J. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, Yale 1975, pp. 118, 155.

16 Apuleius, *Met.* VIII 26, 12: *caue ne solus exedas tam bellum scilicet pullulum*; cf. P. Perruques, *Glossarium Eroticum Linguae Latinae*, Paris 1826, p. 203. «Eat» is also used in a sexual sense in American vernacular.

17 The complimentary tone could be retained here by regarding the writer as masturbating out of frustrated desire for Nigra.

18 S 1329 Adler (citing Plato *comicus* and Menander).

19 In addition to the various literary parallels adduced above, it might be thought that the author of the graffito has chosen his words with some care. *Carbo* and *libenter* occur only here in the *index vocab.* to *CIL* IV, and probably so does *morum* (missing from the index).

20 The last word in the inscription is transcribed by Zangemeister and others as (a) ed (e) o. *Ae* is a common error for *e*; cf. index xiii (*grammatica*) to *CIL* IV. For a detailed look at Pompeian poetry (albeit not the epigram in question), see D. O. Ross, «Nine Epigrams from Pompeii», *YCS* 21, 1969, pp. 127-42.

XV

CATULLAN INTERPRETATIONS: SOME POINTERS

Never having written a word on Catullus, I am dispassionate in the face of H.D. Jocelyn's recent and pugnacious paper[1] on sexual interpretations of that poet, a study that must rank as an important contribution to what we may hope and expect will now become an even more vigorous debate. The following notes on some matters of fact may be of interest to combatants on both sides.

1. Rightly seeking to establish *ancient* understanding of Catullus 2 and 3, J adduces four epigrams by Martial and Juvenal 6.7-8 for the "straight" interpretation. It would be reasonable to subjoin *CLE* 1504 (= *CIL* 14.3565, from Tibur), whose author thought that at least parts of these Catullan poems were appropriate for obscene parody or pastiche.[2]

2. J is impatient with those who take the *passerem Catulli* of Martial 11.6.16 as a vulgar *double entendre*, insisting that "the pretty boys of Antiquity did not welcome anal penetration." In support of this dogma, he adduces Xenophon (*Symp.* 8.21), Plautus (*Pseud.* 780), Martial 8.46, Lucian (*Am.* 27), Strato (*AP* 12.210.3-4, 251), and various statements by K.J. Dover.[3] On general principles (the point will recur with regard to J's quarrel with other scholars over the acceptability of fellatio in ancient society), it may be doubted that there ever was just one view of

1. H.D. Jocelyn (henceforth J), 'On some unnecessarily indecent interpretations of Catullus 2 and 3,' *AJP* 101 (1980), 421-41.

2. Thereby helping editors of Catullus by supporting Priscian's reading of *ligatam* for *negatam* at 2.13.

3. *Greek Homosexuality* (London, 1978).

a particular sexual practice then any more than there is nowadays.[4] Xenophon's view of paederasty (put forward, it should be remembered, by Socrates in the course of debate) cannot have covered all individual cases in real life; Dover himself (p. 204, not noticed by J) is compelled by some of the literary and artistic evidence to concede "a certain reluctance to face facts in Xenophon." Likewise, the cruder version of this argument served up by Lucian, or whoever wrote the *Amores*, is merely a debating point in a diatribe admitted by the author himself to be far-fetched.[5] Which it assuredly is: anal intercourse is represented as physically injurious to boys, harmless for girls!

A single line from Plautus is hardly conclusive of anything. Like Aristophanes, the Roman comedian introduced into his plays frank references to sex in order to provoke robust laughter.[6] Also, one would like to know how the physical aspects of paederasty were treated on the stage by Afranius, whose contamination of plots *puerorum foedis amoribus* is deprecated by Quintilian (10.1.100).

Nor is consistency of attitude to be expected from epigrammatists, Greek or Latin. Martial can both reproach his wife for refusing him anal intercourse and for offering it (11.43, 104)! Similarly, Strato, despite the poems cited by J, more than once allows pleasure to the *eromenos* (*AP* 12.11, 200, 211, 238). Plutarch, in his Dialogue on Love (*Moralia* 768a), albeit disapproving, admits the existence of boys who enjoy the passive role. And in Petronius, the Pergamene boy, although initially seduced by the material gifts of Eumolpus, is presently depicted as insatiably eager for sodomy, being *non contentus iteratione ephebus plenae maturitatis et annis ad patiendum gestientibus.*[7]

4. Who, for instance, would take the view that Lucretius 4.1277: *coniugibus quod nil nostris opus esse videtur* (on movement during intercourse) could in any way reflect a general ancient opinion?

5. *Am.* 27: περιεργότερον εἰπεῖν.

6. In the words of G. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, 1952), 293; cf. the (often extreme) interpretations of L. Gurlitt, *Erotica Plautina* (Munich, 1921); J.N. Hough, 'Miscellanea Plautina: Vulgarity, Extra-dramatic Speeches, Roman Allusions,' *TAPA* 71 (1940), 187, n. 3.

7. *Sat.* 87; cf. 140, where the brother of the girl apparently being sodomised by Eumolpus is equally complacent towards an anal effort by Encolpius.

3. Rightly (as it seems) emphasising that there is no *direct* Latin evidence for *passer* in the sense of penis, J seeks to clinch his argument thus: "Indeed the fact that *passer* et sim. could be used as terms of endearment by lovers while *mentula* et sim. when applied to persons were abusive would seem to exclude the very possibility." This neglects Juvenal 9.54 where Naevolus, in the course of his outpourings against Virro, apostrophises the latter as *passer*. That cannot be a compliment! Given its reputation for salacity, it seems at least plausible that the *passer* could be a symbol. Scholars from Muretus to J himself usually quote Festus, p. 410.17-21 (Lindsay) for this sense of the Greek loan word *strutheum*. Adherents of Giangrande's theory that the *passer* of Catullus is in fact the poet's dead *mentula* may be better served by Pliny, *NH* 10.107: *passeri minimum vitae, cui salacitas par* (sc. to pigeons and turtle-doves). Viewed *sub specie aeternitatis*, the short-lived sparrow could be held to be the ideal symbol for a defunct *mentula*. Finally, an intriguing possibility from the Greek-Coptic Glossary of the sixth-century "poet", Dioscorus of Aphrodito.[8] A section dealing with the reproductive organs begins with the Greek word *κνοφόρος*, for which the given Coptic equivalent means sparrow. Puzzled, Bell-Crum suggest that the Greek here denotes the womb. But conceivably the penis is meant, the sense being "producer of pregnancy." Either way, we seem to have an item of Coptic sexual slang here. The evidence of this Glossary gains interest from a subsequent entry which gives the Greek word *ῥόμβος* an apparently unique sense of *membrum virile*, especially when we remember that *passer* can also stand for a kind of fish, one linked with the rhombus by Pliny, *NH* 9. 72.

4. J denies that Catullus could have admitted to masturbating, above all with pleasure, since Greeks and Romans "associated this with children, slaves, country-bumpkins and men in situations limiting sexual opportunity." To some extent, this dogma depends upon the traditional equation *masturbari/manu stuprari*, an etymology that some scholars would nowadays deny. Artemidorus

8. Text and commentary by H.I. Bell & W.E. Crum, *Aegyptus* 6 (1925), 206.

9. Notably J.P. Hallett, 'Masturbator, Mascarpio,' *Glotta* 54 (1976), 292-308.

Daldianus, who will later be seen to be very narrow-minded in sexual matters, in his tripartite division of sexual practices (*Oneirocr.* 1.78-80) classifies masturbation as licit, natural, and acceptable. In his critique of sexual behaviour as a whole, Agathias (*AP* 5.302) concludes by sanctioning self-abuse on the precedent of a common[10] anecdote which has the Cynic Diogenes recommend masturbation as an easy relief from erotic distractions. Possibly Catullus is comically casting himself in the role of Cynic philosopher.

5. The sarcastic dismissal by J of Gentili's and Giangrande's view that fellatio was reckoned an acceptable practice does not sufficiently observe the distinction between *fellatrix* and *fellator*: the latter was an object of greater abuse in Martial and company. Worse yet was cunnilinctus, an activity unsparingly denounced in comedy and epigram and flatly said by Galen 12.249 (Kühn) to be more revolting than fellatio. As with sodomy, it remains implausible that all Greeks and Romans thought the same way about any of these practices.

6. J deprecates Boardman's suggestion that the frequency of exotic sexual postures on vase paintings and the rarity of the "missionary" position have to do with ordinary Athenian sexual life and the lack of mattresses in houses. Yet Artemidorus (1.79) specifically states that standing positions are only used in the absence of a mattress; he also argues that all sexual positions save that of belly to belly are lewd and unnatural!

7. With regard to *Veneres Cupidinesque* at Catullus 13.12, J will no doubt be sorry to learn that the *unguentum* in that passage has now been given[12] a vaginal/anal connotation. Whatever the truth of that, it is worth adding that the Venus/Cupido collocation is also picked up in *CLE* 1504.42, 45-6, the aforementioned Priapic parody of Catullus.

10. Diogenes Laertius 6.2.46; Dio Chrysostom 6.17-20; Diogenes, *Ep.* 42 (Hercher); Galen 8.419 (Kühn).

11. For references, see J's article, 431, n. 48. Add J.J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven, 1975), 51-2; J.P. Hallett, '*Morigerari*: Suetonius, *Tiberius* 44,' *L'Ant. Class.* 47 (1978), 197, n. 4, albeit her examples from Martial (2.50; 9.40; 11.46) do *not* clinch the argument.

12. By R.J. Littman, 'The Unguent of Venus: Catullus 13,' *Latomus* 36 (1977), 123-8; J.P. Hallett, 'Divine Unction: Some further thoughts on Catullus 13,' *Latomus* 37 (1978), 747-8.

8. To J's examples of divinities mourning dead animals and pets, one might add *CLE* 1517.1: *ereptam volucrem Cupido luget*, in thought and language an item of obvious relevance to the present debate over Catullan interpretations.

XVI

HORACE ON SEX

The relatively few critics who have discussed *Sermones*, I, 2 have usually missed the point.[1] Horace is not preaching on the dangers of adultery,[2] nor disapproving of visits to brothels,[3] nor holding up liaisons with *libertinae* as an Aristotelian golden mean.[4] His prime concern is rather to make fun of the grand passions of the Love Poets by reducing sex to a comic physical exercise. The didactic tone of the poem is largely parody and has no serious intent. If any affinities are sought, Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* is a better place to look than philosophical diatribes against physical passion.

This mock didactic tone is partly designed to recall Lucretius; it comes well from one who later described himself as *Epicuri de grege porcum* for the benefit of the solemn Tibullus.[5] The first line of the poem with its pentasyllabic ending, *pharmacopolae*, is reminiscent of the Lucretian invocation to Venus:

> Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divumque voluptas,
> alma Venus, caeli subter labentia signa
> quae mare navigerum, quae terras frugiferentis
> concelebras, per te quoniam genus omne animantum
> concipitur visitque exortum lumina solis. . . .[6]

Further extension of this comparison shows the effectiveness of Horace's opening four lines, which are often criticised as being

[1] The major discussions are those of E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 76-86; G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace* (Wisconsin, 1920), pp. 248-74; P. Lejay, *Oeuvres d'Horace: Satires* (Paris, 1911), pp. 29-37; N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 9-12; D. Armstrong, "Horace, *Satires* I, 1-3: A Structural Study," *Arion*, III (1964), pp. 86-96; C. Dessen, "The Sexual and Financial Mean in Horace's *Serm.*, I, 2," *A.J.P.*, LXXXIX (1968), pp. 200-8. These will hereinafter be referred to by author only. I regard Dessen as being nearest to the true interpretation of this poem.

[2] Fraenkel, pp. 78-9.

[3] Rudd, p. 11 (with some qualification).

[4] Fiske, p. 248.

[5] *Epistles*, I, 4, 16.

[6] *De Rerum Natura*, I, 1-5.

irrelevant to the rest of the poem.[7] The open-handed Tigellius was the source of *voluptas* for his socially unacceptable followers. The dancers, pantomimes, and other raffish hangers-on fulfil the role *hominum divumque*; Tigellius is the source of their well-being just as Venus is the *genetrix* of Aeneas' descendants. Nor is the Venereal connection inapposite. It is unlikely that the mutual attraction between Tigellius and the *ambubaiarum collegia* rested solely on music. A man who was intimate with Julius Caesar, Cleopatra, and Octavian seems eminently capable of a bed and bard relationship with dancing-girls and actresses.[8] The lampoon on him by Calvus also suggests that Tigellius' sex life was notoriously colourful.[9]

Other Lucretian echoes seem more than coincidental. For example, Horace's use of the archaic *-ier* form of the present infinitive passive.[10] And the lines (90-5):

> Hoc illi recte: ne corporis optima Lyncei
> contemplere oculis, Hypsaea caecior illa
> quae mala sunt spectes. 'o crus! o bracchia!' verum
> depugis, nasuta, brevi latere ac pede longo est.
> matronae praeter faciem nil cernere possis,
> cetera, ni Catia est, demissa veste tegentis.

recall Lucretius' ridicule of the lovesick men who blind themselves to the physical defects of their women.[11] There is perhaps more than parody here. Horace implies throughout his poem that *matronae* are just as good in bed as strumpets and freedwomen. Not so Lucretius who, after cataloguing the postures adopted by harlots to avoid pregnancy and give maximum pleasure to their clients, adds the stuffy note that such expertise is unbecoming to a wife.[12]

The didactic method is nicely taken off in other ways. A

[7] E.g., by Fraenkel, p. 77.

[8] On Tigellius, see Rudd, p. 139.

[9] Calvus called him *Sardi Tigelli putidum caput*. Readers of Martial will be familiar with this type of sexual imputation. The hapless female victim of Horace, *Epode*, 8, is introduced thus: *rogare longo putidam te saeculo*.

[10] Three examples in this poem: *laudarier* (35), *sectarier* (78), *avellier* (104).

[11] *De Rerum Natura*, IV, 1157-70.

[12] *Ibid.*, 1277: *coniugibus quod nil nostris opus esse videtur*.

notable example is the parody of Ennius'

> Audire est operae pretium, procedere recte
> qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere vultis.

by lines 37-38:

> Audire est operae pretium, procedere recte
> qui moechis non vultis. . . .[13]

Equally to the point is the adducing of Cato's *dia sententia* to condone at least the occasional visit to a 'stinking' brothel. In view of Cato's sexual arrangements for his own slaves, it is not totally inappropriate to introduce him here as advocate. But there is still humour in citing Cato for a defence of whoremongering, and Horace is careful to underline the point by both language and subtle omission. The brothel is described as *olenti*, a smell that follows closely on the odours of Rufillus' breath and Gargonius' armpits (*pastillos Rufillus olet, Gargonius hircum*). Cato rounds off his dictum with the blunt verb *permolere*.[14] However, Horace omits the rest of the traditional Catonian advice in which the Censor rebuked the same young man for obeying his recommendation too enthusiastically. The concluding episode in the poem is almost a self-parody. The uproar and panic caused by the husband returning home to find his wife entertaining a lover is almost identical to the disturbing of the mice at their stolen dinner in *Sermones*, II, 6.[15]

[13] Porphyrion approved this little parody as *urbane*.

[14] This verb occurs only here in Horace. Lucilius has the simple verb *molere* in a sexual sense (fr. 278), as does Ausonius (*Epigr.*, 71, 7). For Lucilian elements in this Horatian poem, see Fiske, p. 271.

[15] Compare the passages:

> ianua frangatur, latret canis, undique magno
> pulsa domus strepitu resonet, vae pallida lecto
> desiliat mulier, miseram se conscia clamet,
> cruribus haec metuat, doti deprensa, egomet mi.
> discincta tunica fugiendum est ac pede nudo,
> ne nummi pereant aut puga aut denique fama.
> (*Serm.*, I, 2, 128-33)

And:

> ille cubans gaudet mutata sorte bonisque
> rebus agit laetum convivam, cum subito ingens
> valvarum strepitus lectis excussit utrumque.
> currere per totum pavidi conclave, magisque
> exanimes trepidare, simul domus alta Molossis
> personuit canibus. (*Serm.*, II, 6, 110-15)

Similarities of language and imagery are striking. The adulterers at their stolen sexual feast are comparable to the mice at their surrepti-

Horace's ridicule of the conventions of Roman Love Poetry is palpable. His inversion of the *paraclausithyron* situation is a striking example. Horace's gallants are forever in trouble by being caught *inside* the wrong bedroom. Adulterers have to leap from rooftops to escape; if caught, they are beaten up, urinated on by lackeys, or even castrated.[16] Villius is later given as an example of the Romeo who is roughly handled.[17] The poem ends with the repeated warning of what may befall the adulterer detected in the act. Another way in which Horace suggests that the game is not worth it is by advising that, if there is no safely accessible woman to hand, a boy will do just as well. Cerinthus may have legs equal to those of many women,[18] and a boy is as suitable as a girl when lust becomes intolerable.[19] This advice is particularly relevant to Tibullus who switched from Delia and Glycera [20] to a brief passion for the boy Marathus who is soon displaced in favour of the appropriately named Nemesis. It is surely relevant to find Horace later writing his Odes to lovelorn Tibullus and the forlorn Valgius, urging them to stop grieving after girls or boys.[21] Horace's friend, Virgil, though of different temperament, has the same attitude in his second *Eclogue*. Corydon, after wailing for over sixty lines about his unrequited love for Alexis (he reveals, *en passant*, that he has been equally unlucky with the moody Amaryllis), abruptly concludes his threnody by observing that another boy will serve his purpose adequately enough.[22]

The point is again shown up by language. The niceties of erotic compliment do not occur. Instead, the concentration is entirely on bluntly physical terms. The talk is all of *cunni albi*, of *futuo* and *permolere*, of *tument inguina* and *tentigine rumpi*. One does not woo a slave girl or boy, one makes an *impetus*

tious banquet. The crashing of doors and barking dogs bring terror and flight in both cases.

[16] *Serm.*, I, 2, 41 ff.

[17] *Ibid.*, 64 ff. There is an obvious play on the names *Fausta* and *Sullae gener* in this unlucky context.

[18] *Ibid.*, 81-2: *sit licet hoc, Cerinthe, tuum—tenerum est femur aut crus/ rectius, atque etiam melius persaepe togatae est.*

[19] *Ibid.*, 117-18. I cite these lines later on.

[20] See G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy* (London, 1959), pp. 62 ff.

[21] *Odes*, I, 33 consoles Tibullus on his grief for *immitis Glycerae*. *Odes*, II, 9 is addressed to Valgius, who laments a deceased boy friend.

[22] *Ecl.*, 2, 73: *invenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexim.*

upon them. Women are evaluated like quality horses, the hunting image is dominant, and the cost of an affaire is paramount.[23] Nor does the culprit Villius invoke any god, after his escapade; rather is his conscience located in his penis.[24]

Traditional doctrines concerning this poem are easy to demolish. Adultery is ridiculed, but not censured. A sharp and meaningful distinction. The only objection to adultery is the physical danger involved, if caught. The sin is not the act itself, but getting caught. Horace says explicitly that there is no distinction, on this level, between matron and prostitute (62-3):

> quid inter-
> est in matrona, ancilla peccesne togata?

The idea that Horace is recommending *libertinae* as the happy medium is not supported by his language. This class is introduced by the punning description *classe secunda*,[25] and Sallustius is at once cited as an example of how easy it is to get into trouble with freedwomen. This *caveat* is odd, if we are to assume that such liaisons are put forward as an alternative to the physical dangers of adultery and the socially unacceptable *meretrix*. And since many *meretrices* were also *libertinae*, the distinction is unreal.

One piece of advice only is put forward unambiguously by Horace: take sex as the opportunity arises, without emotional involvement and with a partner who can neither argue with you nor cause trouble for you (116-19):

> . . . tument tibi cum inguina, num si
> ancilla aut verna est praesto puer, impetus in quem
> continuo fiat, malis tentigine rumpi?
> non ego: namque parabilem amo venerem facilemque.

Social status and even the sex of the partner are not important, and the pleasure of the quick tumble is set above any preaching about moderation. A final tilt at grand passion can be seen in the lines (125-6):

[23] This aspect is well discussed by Dessen, pp. 204 ff.

[24] Another Lucilian reminiscence (see Fiske, *loc. cit.*), but there is a touch of parody of the usual Horatian inclusion of dialogue within the *Sermones*.

[25] The pun is noticed by Armstrong, p. 89. The pun is quite a notable feature of this poem.

haec ubi supposuit dextro corpus mihi laevum
Ilia et Egeria est: do nomen quodlibet illi. . . .

There is surely an appropriate pun on the name *Ilia* here and the message is clear: all cats are gray in the dark.

The poem, then, is to be taken as entirely satirical. It is innocent of any moral message. This does not mean that it is out of joint with the other *Sermones*. It is usually taken to be one of the earliest, if not the earliest, of the collection.[26] The term *Sermo* is suitably flexible, and there is no reason to suppose that Horace always felt obliged to make a serious point. The language and style of this poem are more in tune with the *Epodes*, and it is there that analogies should probably be sought. It can, however, be subjoined that our present poem follows *Sermones*, I, 1 rather pleasantly.[27] After expounding the folly of dissatisfaction with one's lot, a totally mocking discussion of the male pursuit of women, where dissatisfactions tend to be prevalent, makes the point perfectly. The opinion that no woman is worth suffering for comes well from the man who later wrote:

nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri.[28]

If we risk the dangerous connection of the poet's art with his personal experiences, we can say that Horace did suffer in pursuit of women and came to the conclusion that sex could be a satisfactory substitute for passion. Ovid reached the same conclusion. The outpourings of Catullus and Propertius and Tibullus (and let us conjecture that Virgil may have made the point to Horace concerning the unfortunate Gallus) must have seemed increasingly absurd to Horace. He would have agreed with Lord Chesterfield's dictum about the transience of the pleasure, the exorbitance of the expense, and the frankly ridiculous nature of the position.

[26] See Fraenkel, p. 76.

[27] See Armstrong for the structural unity of *Sermones*, I, 1-3.

[28] *Epistles*, I, 1, 14. Horace need not be thought of as a misogynist, but women frequently come off badly in his poetry. Apart from the enigmatic Canidia and her henchwoman Sagana, we may cite Cinara in the *Epistles* (referred to as *protervae* and *rapaci*), Phryne in *Epode* 14 (significantly a *libertina*), the celebrated Pyrrha in *Odes*, I, 5, and the victims of *Epode* 8 and *Epode* 12.

XVII

EROS IN GRAECO-ROMAN SOCIETY AND LITERATURE

The thought of what America would be like
if the Classics had a wide circulation
troubles my sleep.

Ezra Pound

One might, by way of answer to the above, rephrase a well-known Roman proverb to read: *Amor vincit insomnia.* Pound's comment, written in the 1920s, is typical of the tendency to idealise the "classical" attitude towards sex and sexual freedom as being one of healthy tolerance and of acceptance of sex as a basic natural function, not to be contaminated by taboos and prejudices. This is an understandable reaction from the hypocritical and often oppressive attitudes of Anglo-Saxon and North American societies. It is notable that a prime example of this idealising approach is Henry Miller (most explicitly, of course, in his *Colossus of Maroussi,* but the theme is implicit throughout his major works such as the *Tropics* and the *Rosy Crucifixion*), one of our most persecuted writers on sexual themes. Wayland Young, whose book *Eros Denied* I consider to be the best and most sensible account of sex

and Western Society, falls into the same error of assuming a uniform attitude on the part of Greeks and Romans.[1] A natural consequence of this error is to assume that the Graeco-Roman world enjoyed an enviable tolerance until the advent of the Christian Church. Now, the Church has been one of the worst influences on sexual thinking. Its baneful tradition goes back to the aberrations of Paul of Tarsus, a perfect candidate for the psychiatric couch. His seed, unhappily, if the expression may be used in this context, fell upon very fertile ground. But regardless of the battle between the Christian Church and Eros in classical society, there still remains the paradox mentioned by Peter Green (in his *Essays in Antiquity*) that the Greeks have suffered from nothing so much as the deadening myth of perfection. This paper is devoted to puncturing the myth of perfection.

There is no such thing as a "classical attitude" towards sex. Mercifully. Greek and Roman attitudes varied very much with the individual; to some extent, also, with the various States. In Athens, individual freedom of private behaviour was prized above all else, at least in theory. The State claimed certain obligations on the part of its individual citizens, in political and military matters, but did not attempt very much in the way of social legislation. Here, a class distinction needs to be made. The rights of an adult male Athenian citizen were quite sharply distinguished from those allowed to women, resident foreigners, and slaves. This distinction obtained in sexual matters. For example, Solon, one of the earliest lawgivers, and venerated as the "founder" of the Athenian Democracy, is said to have forbidden slaves to engage in paederasty.

In Sparta, the rights of the individual were subordinated to the demands of the State. The ideal of communal living for the citizen males, in military barracks, imposed severe restrictions on their domestic life. A husband might visit his wife only on certain occasions, and then in a somewhat clandestine fashion. The chronic shortage of manpower in Sparta was allied to the Spartan belief in eugenics. To this end, sickly babies were exposed at birth, by order of the State, and Spartan women were encouraged to sleep with men other than their husbands in the hope of producing a perfect child from a perfect mate. A natural consequence of the communal living of the men was widespread homosexuality and paederasty. Spartans were quite notorious for this, as Old Attic Comedy attests, with two important results. In Athens, admirers of the Spartan system tended to affect homosexual tastes, earning them a good deal of ridicule from Aristophanes, who is playing to a gallery of ordinary Athenian citizens and countrymen

[1] *Eros Denied*, New York: Grove Press, 1964, 70-76. For more detailed accounts of the whole subject see: H. Licht, *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece*, London, 1932; O. Kiefer, *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*, London, 1934. A slighter work of some interest is R. Flacelière, *Love in Ancient Greece*, English translation by J. Cleugh, London, 1962.

from Attica. This audience may well have despised male homosexuality, not simply as "effeminate", but as something "foreign". The other consequence is that Athenian intellectuals such as Plato idealised the Spartan way of life to an absurd degree, providing the basis for Plato's suggested sexual regulations in his *Republic*.

As to Rome, we may briefly distinguish the Republican and Imperial periods. Almost all Romans paid at least lip service to the importance of tradition. For them, tradition consisted in exalting the superior ways of their ancestors (*mos maiorum*), a practice typical of such Roman moralists as Horace, Juvenal and Tacitus. Down to the period of Julius Caesar and Augustus, Rome was governed largely by the Senatorial aristocracy, a body that made occasional attempts to regulate the private lives of citizens and subjects. One of the chief magistrates of the Roman Republic was the *Censor*; two persons were appointed to the office annually. The office had little in common with the modern censors of books and films, but it did bear on the private lives of the Senators. The Censors could expel Senators from the Senate for "immorality", a charge not always well defined in practice; there was a celebrated case involving the archetypal Cato, who had a Senator expelled for kissing his wife in public. This was an extreme case, but shows to what depths the usually sensible Romans could sink. With the coming of the emperors, private morality was far more subject to legislation. Augustus, the most notable ruler in this respect, passed a series of laws designed to encourage marriage and procreation, and to penalise celibates. These laws naturally failed. The policies of his successors varied widely, according to their individual dispositions. The early Christian emperors reverted to the attitude of Augustus, and there was an ever-increasing amount of social legislation in the fourth and fifth centuries.

The attitude of a State is, after all, only a manifestation of a number of individuals' attitudes. The definition of Law as a crystallisation of the popular prejudice applies with particular force to sexual legislation. In the context of Greece and Rome, we shall see that this point obtains as much as it does in our own societies, especially in the sphere of homosexuality.

It is logical, before examining the question of Eros in Greek and Roman literature, to survey the role of Eros in classical religion and mythology. In addition, a consideration of the legislation of classical societies concerning sex activities will be offered to help to illumine the question of freedom to deal with sexual matters in literature.

It is well known that Love was personified as a goddess by both Greeks and Romans. The Greek language has more than one word for "Love", a fact which leads to the loss of shades of meaning in English translation. The three essential Greek words are: *Eros* (basically relat-

ing to physical love); *Philia* (basically relating to the concept of friendship); *Agape* (the word usually employed in the New Testament to signify the concept of concern for fellow men). These words, and their cognates, are not used with absolute precision throughout extant Greek literature. The goddess is primarily associated with physical love. In Homer, she is discovered *in flagrante delicto* with the god of War by her cuckolded husband (also a god, albeit a crippled one). Her fellow Olympians, however, treat her adultery as a matter for laughter rather than censure. A system of divine eugenics ensures that her son assumes her role as an inspirer of passion in human beings; here, as before, precision of language clarifies the point: Cupid's name was derived from *cupido*, which indicates strong passion.

This Homeric anecdote raises a point not always appreciated. It is conventional to describe Homer's gods as anthropomorphic. Indeed, the early Greek philosopher Xenophanes (*fl.* 550 B.C.) regarded them with disgust precisely because of their resemblance to men. He criticised Homer and Hesiod, in his own verses, for imputing human vices to the gods. (Any standard account of pre-Socratic philosophy may be referred to for further details.) The charming picture of a family of gods with human foibles requires an important corrective. It is true that, as a rule, the Greeks and Romans did not look to their gods for moral precepts. However, divine misconduct did not sanction human emulation. The Greek society that smiled at Homer's adulterous Aphrodite was also capable of granting to husbands the legal power to kill an adulterous wife and her paramour. In contrast, the errant husband did not run the risk of suffering from the same penalty. The principle that a husband was allowed to wander outside the conjugal boudoir was sanctified by the Athenian orator Demosthenes. He is made to say: "We keep mistresses for pleasure, concubines for daily use, and wives to produce legitimate children and to look after our property". Actually, it was disputed in Antiquity as to whether the speech containing this *mot* was really by Demosthenes. The question of authorship does not affect the point at issue. This state of affairs is natural in a society where the men monopolised the function of lawmaking. But it is important to draw a distinction between what was permitted to human beings and what was granted to the Olympians. In a lengthy episode in the *Iliad*, Zeus's many amours are catalogued, in detail. Included is a reference to intercourse with his sister Hera, later to serve (officially, that is) as his wife. The element of comedy dominates the entire passage. But this did not mitigate the abhorrence of the majority of Greeks for incest; otherwise the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles would not have been written.

The sexual imagery in much classical myth and visual art is pronounced. Representations of Hermes and Priapus in the form of statues frequently include an erection of the penis. In the Comedies of Aristophanes, performed at a festival in honour of Dionysus, there are

references to the large and ornamental phallus worn by the comic actors to amuse the audience.

The freedom of language in Aristophanes is celebrated. One need only recall the controversies in London, in 1958, when *Lysistrata* was presented in the West End, in an unabashed English version. The freedom of language far surpasses anything granted to our own stage, although we are approaching, at long last, a similar freedom for the printed word. It is ironic that our slow advances are being dubbed as "new" and "progressive", when we are merely attempting to regain something very old. Aristophanes' bawdy is usually explained by reference to the Athenian concern for *parrhesia* (freedom of speech), and defended (though one often has the feeling that he is more apologised for than defended) by appealing to the nature of the Dionysian rituals. There is a modicum of truth in this. The aforementioned imitation phallus may represent a contemporaneously practised or obsolete ritual. Aristophanes does, occasionally, formally connect Dionysus with his "obscene" allusions, most notably in *The Frogs*, in which Dionysus appears as a leading character. There is one remarkable passage, which has the god allude to an incident when he was sexually excited, as a voyeur, and relieved himself by masturbation.

But there is a danger of exaggeration. Not all Athenians approved of such freedom. There was more than one attempt to restrain the stage comedians by law. Pericles himself may have been instrumental in one such attempt.[2] We are not obliged to impute these efforts to an Athenian Mrs. Grundyism. The political libels, aimed at leading men of the day, were more objected to, in all probability, than the bawdy jokes. Again, the very concentration of Aristophanes on "obscenity" makes one suspect some sort of desire to shock. In any case there certainly were Athenians who took strong exception to the traditional stories concerning the gods, Plato being the supreme example. Nor should it be forgotten that Dionysus was an unorthodox and controversial god; *The Bacchae* of Euripides stands as eloquent testimony to this.

It should always be remembered that attitudes varied widely in the Greek world. Modern writers constantly regard Athenian standards as synonymous with Greek ones as a whole. This is quite wrong. For instance, many Athenians professed to be shocked by the Spartan custom of allowing girls to take exercise in the nude, alongside boys. Plato, by contrast, approved of this practice and was for extending this equality to cover war and training for leadership. Corinth enjoyed a reputation for its amenable and venal women. A Graeco-Roman proverb said: "Not every man is lucky enough to be able to go to Corinth". Plato warned athletes in training to avoid Corinthian girls.

[2]There was one attempt in 440 B.C., another in 415. Horace refers to the suppression of the freedom of Old Comedy (with implicit approval) in his didactic poem *De Arte Poetica.*

The fulminations of Paul of Tarsus are witness to the revival of Corinth's basic industry, after the town's destruction and re-creation by the Romans.

We may now turn to the question of legal and social attitudes towards Eros on the part of the Greeks and Romans; then we shall be in a better position to understand their treatment of sex in literature. One point is immediately obvious. The scale was balanced in favour of the male, as we have seen already. Adultery might be hazardous because of the right accorded by tradition and law to the wronged husband. Of course, our picture is unbalanced, for almost all surviving Greek and Roman literature is written by men. Sappho is virtually the only example of the female voice (there are some love poems in Latin written by a certain Sulpicia, of whom we know little or nothing). Women could and did participate in literary activities. However, male reaction was less than kind. Witness, for example, Aristophanes' treatment of Pericles' *bas bleu* mistress, Aspasia; the Roman satirist Juvenal regards the woman who recites poetry as one of the most odious types in his gallery of Roman women. Thus the status of women varied widely in ancient societies. A woman became Pharaoh in Egypt (the celebrated Hatshepsut). Cretan art seems to depict women on more or less equal social terms with their menfolk. But it is unsafe to base much on this sort of evidence, although it would give point to the Greek claim that paederasty was introduced into Greece from Crete! In the Athenian democracy, the woman was supposed, though the idea has been absurdly exaggerated by modern writers,[3] to stay out of public life and away from the public eye. Pericles' comment in his Funeral Speech, as recorded (or fabricated) by Thucydides, is instructive: "The greatest glory of a woman is to be least talked about by men, whether they are speaking in praise or criticism." If Pericles really did say this, he is inconsistent, if not hypocritical. Aspasia hardly lives up to his prescription!

The status of Roman women changed in the later Republic and early Empire. Divorce became easier. Women began to demand a more official role in the affairs of state, though unofficial pillow talk had always obtained, of course, and they also began to take an interest in literature. We should notice, in this context, that women always played an important part in religious life. The opportunities varied tremendously. She might be Vestal Virgin or Temple Prostitute, Priestess of Apollo or, like the sister to the eccentric Roman Emperor Caligula, sister-wife to her self-deified husband and then deified herself.

This change in attitude towards woman and her status met with

[3]The best corrective to the usual nonsense is C. Seltzman, *Women in Antiquity*, London, 1956.

bitter opposition from Roman writers such as Juvenal, who is responsible for creating our stereotype of the Roman woman of the early Empire as a cruel, lustful, unfaithful creature. Since we have no Greek or Roman equivalent to Simone de Beauvoir or Edna O'Brien, the picture is hopelessly unbalanced.[4] The triumph of the Christian Church, with its own prejudices against women playing any real role in secular affairs (a regression from the pre-Christian status of women as religious officials), has not helped.

Fornication seems never to have been illegal in Greek and Roman society. We might infer this from the legal tolerance accorded to the female prostitute, and from the acceptance of concubinage as suggested in the statement (quoted earlier) attributed to Demosthenes. The very word "fornication" derives from one of several Latin words for brothel (*fornix*). The Latin Dictionary shows that the word *fornicari* was introduced and applied to sexual intercourse outside of marriage by the early Christian writers; it is employed by the ascetic Tertullian and also in the Vulgate. Evidence for the legal and social acceptance of fornication by the male is widespread. Kiefer, in *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*, quotes a passage from Cicero's speech *Pro Caelio*:

> If there is any man who thinks that young men should not be allowed to make love, even to prostitutes, he is indeed a man of strong moral righteousness, but he is out of touch with our contemporary attitudes, and even with the standards of our ancestors. For when was this sort of wenching not customary? When was it censured? When was it not allowed? When was it unlawful to do what was lawfully allowed? (p. 55)

It is fair to say that we should always take Cicero with a pinch of salt, especially when (as here) he is defending a client whose private life was extravagant; but his reference to Roman tradition in this context is decisive. Moreover, the censor Cato is said by Plutarch (*Life of Cato*, 21) to have established brothels on his estates for the benefit of his slaves. This same Cato is also made to defend the legal and social tolerance of brothels in Rome, in one of Horace's most pungent satires, on the grounds that their existence helps to reduce the incidence of adultery, since they afford an outlet for young men. Indeed, in this passage (*Satires* 1, 2, 31-34), Horace applauds Cato's dictum as "divine". It may also be noted that the reforming Emperor Augustus made no effort to outlaw simple fornication as part of his crusade. There is no need to multiply evidences. Acceptance of male fornication

[4] It is a pity that so many writers persist in accepting the exaggerations of Juvenal as formal history. A reasonably balanced view is given by J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Roman Women*, London, 1962.

is implicit in almost all extant Greek and Roman literature.[5] Adultery, attended by physical and legal hazards, began to be punished only by the early Christian emperors.

The greatest contrast between ancient and modern sexual legislation is in the field of so-called perversions. By and large, a Greek or Roman had the freedom of his own genitals. There is no parallel to the American attempts to regulate the details of what happens in beds, even between man and wife. There was, indeed, one attempt by a Roman politician of the Republican period to introduce some sort of law concerning sexual behaviour. The terms of the bill specified *nefanda Venere* (wicked love), but we do not know how this ambiguous phrase was defined. Perhaps it had to do with male prostitutes, who were certainly legislated against by a Roman emperor in the third century A.D., and by some of the early Christian emperors. We know, too, that Roman law provided for penalties against rape and seduction of pupils by teachers.[6] Apart from regulations governing female prostitutes, the above appears to be the sum total of sexual legislation.

In general, apart from the restrictions already mentioned, it is safe to say that homosexuality was legal in both Greek and Roman society. There was little or none of the modern concern with diagnosing and "explaining" the homosexual, much less any attempt to "cure" him. Particular types of homosexual behaviour were specified. Paederasty, for example, was recognised to be a distinct type of homosexual preference. It was imputed to such people as the dramatist Sophocles, and to Zeus! Attitudes to male homosexuals varied. But many people disapproved altogether; at least they missed no chance to ridicule and criticise the male homosexual. Aristophanes caricatures the mincing fairy as cruelly as does our society in burlesque. Such victims are named quite openly. The pathic or passive type was singled out for particular mockery. The satiric poet Martial is very precise in his clinical accounts of various forms of sexual behaviour, and takes as much delight in ridiculing the pathic as does Aristophanes. The much more violent Juvenal attacks male homosexuals unsparingly; in his Second and

[5]See Licht (*op. cit.*, 399) who concludes: "No-one found fault with illegitimate sexual intercourse, but looked upon it as a matter of course and spoke with the utmost frankness about it." Kiefer (*op. cit.*, 60) observes: "It is a fact that originally the Romans had no statutory prohibition of sexual relationships outside marriage."

[6]The bill concerning *nefanda Venere* was introduced by a certain politician named Scantinius. If passed, it appears to have become a dead letter. It is pleasant to observe that this bill was brought in in an age later idealised by Roman moralists as the golden age of virtue! For examples of early Christian laws against certain sexual practices, see C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code*, Princeton, 1952, 232. These deal with regulations against male homosexuals, legislated in 342 and 390 A.D.

Ninth Satires, he includes physical details as explicit as anything paraded by John Rechy, James Baldwin, or Jean Genet.[7]

This attitude has to be balanced against the more familiar "Platonic" picture of a noble love between men (which, as we have indicated, is an idealised picture of the attachments between men in the Spartan and Theban armies). We may hope, at this point, that the hoary old concept of Platonic love may someday be obliterated. To set the record straight, apart from the relationship between men, Plato also advocates (*Republic*, 5:457B - 466D) the following sexual regulations: physical sex between men and women is to be strictly controlled by his Guardian class; wives are to be held in common; a system of eugenics is to be followed for breeding perfect children; men and women are to cohabit at state-organised festivals; young men of special martial distinction are to be given more than usual opportunities for intercourse with selected women; within prescribed age limits, the chief purpose of intercourse shall be procreation. Outside of these limits, promiscuity is countenanced; any chance progeny is to be "disposed of" by the authorities.

In one respect the Greeks and Romans were as guilty of absurdity as are modern legislators regarding lesbianism. Greek and Roman Law likewise permitted this practice by the device of not noticing it. The attitude of Greek and Roman literature is curious, although we must recall the fact that almost all of this is by men. Lesbianism is only infrequently alluded to. Aristophanes uses it as a source of laughter; so also does Martial, despite the fact that some of their references have been misconstrued. For instance, in his *Lysistrata*, Aristophanes has the women refer to the Milesian dildo, which is said to be currently unavailable. However, his women are very definitely heterosexual (this, after all, is the whole point of his play), and it is medically established nowadays that the dildo is not a basic form of gratification for lesbians, but for heterosexual women deprived of normal intercourse (for a Greek discussion of the dildo, readers are referred to the Sixth Mime of Herondas, a writer of the third century B.C.). Juvenal, in his attack on homosexual philosophers, makes a point of asserting his belief that women athletes do not perform *cunnilinctus* on each other; and he does not attack women on the grounds of lesbianism in his long poem against the sex.

A word on Sappho. Her association with Lesbos, coupled with stories about the nature of personal relationships there, inspired Aristophanes to make play with the invented word *Lesbiazein*. This is

[7]The opening lines of his Ninth Satire are the best example; an act of oral-genital intercourse, with a touch of *anilinctio*, is described. The whole poem concerns the career of a male prostitute. Juvenal's attitude to physiological functions is often described as Swiftian, though some would accuse him of taking a prurient delight in the vices he professes to attack. His Second Satire is aimed at homosexual philosophers, and has some graphic physical details.

the source of our own word, and the use of "Sapphic" as synonymous with lesbian. In point of fact, it is quite unclear whether Sappho's sexual tastes ran to women. Her poems provide no very clear evidence; she expresses passion for both sexes, and the mutilated state of her literary fragments defies any final analysis. Most of the ancient evidence derives from the aforementioned joke of Aristophanes. Whether Sappho had sex with girls or not, it is as well to indicate the tenuous nature of the evidence for the tradition.

Finally, in this general context of sexual legislation, the question of female prostitution must be considered. On this well documented subject, I confine myself to a few salient points.[8] Prostitution was legal in Greek and Roman society. Temple prostitution was only one facet, clearly distinguishable from the ubiquitous secular type. The status of the prostitute varied, according to age, looks and other attainments. Call-girls (whom the Athenians designated by the euphemism of "companions"), streetwalkers and brothel girls all co-existed. Our best evidence concerns the Roman period. The *lupanars* of Pompeii afford visual impressions of the trade; literary allusions (again, we stress, all from the male viewpoint) abound. The Roman authorities exercised a good deal of control over the activities of the girls. Streetwalkers had to register their names with the relevant authorities, and were obliged to wear distinctive garments. There was some attempt to regulate the opening hours of the brothels. The state, not excluding the early Christian emperors, was not above taking a share of the girls' earnings through taxation.

The question of venereal disease is a matter of dispute. The establishment of the Christian Church brought no great change, apart from the sensational efforts of the Empress Theodora, herself a great luminary of the profession (as readers of Gibbon will recall), to coerce the girls of Constantinople into reform. The girls were herded into a House of Repentance, on the Black Sea coast. Many were said to have committed suicide in preference to remaining there. The evidence, however, is from the hostile historian of the period, Procopius. In fine, the legal position of the female prostitute is in marked contrast to her counterpart in North America, and this needs to be remembered in the context of our topic.

The literature of Greece and Rome reflects the above religious and

[8]The most useful book is Fernando Henriques, *The Pretence of Love*, London, 1962. This has chapters on Greek and Roman prostitution. Licht and Kiefer also deal with the subject and supply the primary source references. Perhaps the most interesting primary sources are the *Dialogues of the Courtesans*, by the Greek satirist Lucian (second century A.D.). It may be noted that this same Lucian was stigmatised as the Anti-Christ by the Byzantine scholiasts, although his actual references to Christianity are few and not specially malicious.

social attitudes. It would be hard to discover a single example of censorship of literature on the grounds of sexual content; political censorship is another matter and is not relevant here. The case of Ovid is a doubtful exception. It is frequently maintained by textbook writers that Ovid was exiled by Augustus because of the latter's objections to the poem *Ars Amatoria*. However, this is but one of the many speculations which tend to be passed off as fact.[9]

It is difficult to classify types of literature dealing, in respect of theme or vocabulary, or both, with sexual subjects. There was a concept of erotic literature, despite the statement by Wayland Young: "The very existence of such things as erotic books or pornography in the Graeco-Roman culture is uncertain" (*Eros Denied*, 71). Plutarch, in his *Biography of Crassus*, mentions that the obscene Milesian Tales of Aristides were found in the Roman military baggage looted by the Parthians after their defeat of a Roman army in 53 B.C. For the Romans, Miletus tends to occupy the place that Paris does in the general European erotic mythology, and Plutarch is straitlaced on such matters. We need not question the general description of Milesian Tales. (The nearest extant guide to the nature of Milesian Tales is the *Satyricon* of Petronius.) The fact that no example is extant is as inevitable as it is regrettable. Aside from these tales, there is other evidence for the existence of erotic volumes. The emperor Tiberius, for example, kept a book, probably an illustrated manual of sexual positions, from Elephantis.

Pornography is in the eye of the beholder. It is safe to assert that Greek and Roman laws attempted no legal definition of pornography. Simply speaking, it was never an issue, before the advent of the Christian Church. Though once the word "pornography" meant "writings concerning prostitutes", it has lost much of its original meaning in current usage. The Greek word *pornographos* occurs only once in extant literature; there, it should be noted, it is applied to painters, not writers.[10] *The Oxford English Dictionary* gives no example of the use of the English word before the nineteenth century: this we might have expected, though there had been cases involving the law and obscenity before this period. The first cited example shows the word used in its original and technical sense. Unhappily, the *Dictionary* shows that one of the first persons to apply the word in the current loose sense was the classical scholar Mackail![11]

[9]For the countless theories see J. C. Thibault, *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile*, University of California, 1964.

[10]The word occurs in the third-century A.D. Greek writer, Athenaeus, in his *Deipnosophistae* (Learned Men at Dinner), xiii, 567b. This particular volume is devoted to the subject of women; it is translated in the Loeb Classical Library Series, Volume VI.

[11]Webster uses the word, in 1864, with reference to the Pompeian frescoes. Mackail misuses it in his comments on certain plays of Plautus.

Erotic themes abound in Greek and Roman writers. Most of these are too familiar to require detailing. The sensitive question of obscene language is more instructive, and is probably less familiar, in detail, in the Graeco-Roman context. Language rather than theme is frequently the chief issue in modern courts; notably, of course, in the epochal *Lady Chatterley* trial at London in 1959.

Latin offers clearer examples than Greek. Not that it is richer in these: indeed, like English, the Latin language has few swear words fairly classifiable as obscene. We cannot always be sure of the precise level of diction at which each term was used, but most of the examples speak for themselves: *Cunnus* (cunt); *futuo* (fuck); *cacare* (to shit); *mingere* (to piss); *paedicare* (to bugger); *fellare* (to suck off). Lexicographers have been reluctant to offer precise equivalents in English to these terms, and it must also be borne in mind that the Latin words may have undergone certain changes in their level of social acceptability. However, the contexts in which these words are used, and their avoidance by the majority of extant classical authors, seem to establish that these words were generally regarded as "obscene".

These are basic examples; many variations naturally occur.[12] As in English, the words deemed most offensive are anatomical and physiological in basic meaning. Another common phenomenon, exhibited by Latin, is the importation of foreign (Greek in this case) words of obscene meaning.[13] This is part of the process of the development of colloquial Latin which felt the influence of Greek in many towns in Southern Italy, and over the Eastern Empire and parts of the West. The *Satyricon* of Petronius, and the *graffiti* of Pompeii are the prime sources for spoken Latin. Obscene terms are naturally frequent here.[14]

However, the above words are not widely encountered in extant Latin literature, despite the absence of legal compulsion against their

[12]A glossary of terms is appended to Friedrich Karl Forberg's *Manual of Classical Erotology*, New York, 1966. This tome contains a useful, though uncritical, collection of erotic passages from Greek and Latin literature (and from later European traditions). Greek and Roman writers quite often used respectable words in sexual contexts, with comic effect. Aristophanes, for example, uses the word *choiros* (pig) to mean the female pudendum. The late lexicographer Suidas explains this as a piece of slang current in the brothels of Corinth. We may compare Aristophanes' usage to the frequent use of terms such as "little lamb pit" and "fabulous honey-pot" in Terry Southern's *Candy*.

[13]E.g. Petronius imports the Greek verb *laikazein* (to fuck) into the Latin of his *Satyricon*. This is not gratuitous, but serves the purpose of dramatic realism; the action occurs in a Greek town of Southern Italy.

[14]They are not so widespread in Petronius as one would imagine from the reluctance of translators to give a complete English version. It must be remembered, however, that we are uncertain as to the precise meaning of some of his rarer words. There is a good English version by W. Arrowsmith, New York: Mentor Books, 1960. Petronius' themes are more to the point than his obscene diction. The Pompeian *graffiti* are much pithier, as is natural. It is amusing to note that many of the scribbled expressions of sexual satisfaction and yearning are by women; the inflectional precision of the Latin language makes this clear.

use—perhaps it is *because* of the absence of such restraints. They occur most frequently in the poet Martial; and occasionally in Horace and Catullus; hardly, if ever, in Ovid's erotic poetry; and are avoided in the speeches of Cicero. Why? The answer is not easy. A convention, or unwritten tradition, may be part of the answer. The importance of the Roman concept of *urbanitas* (which may be roughly translated as "gentlemanly sophistication") and *gravitas* (which carries the connotation of an accepted standard of decorum in public behaviour) should not be forgotten here. Cicero is not reluctant to use strong colloquialisms in his private letters (for instance, he once describes the Roman people as *faex* or "shit"). Sometimes he will take refuge in a Greek expression. This may be compared to the Gibbonian practice of utilising the obscurity of a learned tongue to cover his use of obscenity. Not that this saved Gibbon from attack;[15] and some of our modern translators have had recourse to strange expedients. The Loeb translator of Martial, to take the best example, in 1919 translated all the scabrous poems into Italian. I can only assume that he regards the Italians as either incorruptible or corrupt beyond redemption.

In general, Roman writers preferred colourful periphrasis and *double entendre* to downright obscenity of expression. Juvenal, who had no qualms about treating sexual subjects in his satirical poems, is an excellent example of this. Catullus, the most fiery of Roman love poets, employs both techniques.[16] The whole matter seems to be largely one of individual preference on the Roman writer's part, and it is idle to lay down rules. Greek writers follow the same individual paths. Aristophanes employs obscene words, whereas the poets of, say, the *Greek Anthology* prefer circumlocutions, often very funny ones,[17] and *double entendre*. The oratory of Demosthenes is unrestrained in matters of personal abuse (neither Greek nor Roman courts had anything in the way of modern libel restrictions), but he seems to eschew obscenity of diction. It should also be obvious from my discussion that the classical stage, unlike the modern, did not suffer from the censoring imbecilities of a Lord Chamberlain.

In the preceding pages, I have used the term "obscene", and its cognates, in purely a technical sense. The general picture I have

[15]Gibbon discusses this attack on his later volumes in his *Autobiography*. As precedent for the use of the "obscurity" of the Latin language, he cites Boileau's dictum: "*Le Latin dans ses mots brave l'honnêteté.*"

[16]Two examples suffice. He describes some wretched rival's writings as *cacata charta* (shit-smeared paper). When assailing his former mistress, Clodia-Lesbia, for her insatiable lust, he says that she exhausts her lovers' penises by "stripping their bark off" (his verb is *glubire*).

[17]A favourite of mine is the description of a girl's pudendum as having the dimensions of the river Eurotas.

painted looks very enviable, from the point of view of those of us who are opposed to censorship of the arts. However, would-be censors existed in both Greek and Roman societies. I have already suggested that the very nature of Aristophanes' bawdy presupposes the existence of people who could be shocked. Plato is the best example, from the history of Athens, of a would-be censor. He sets down his concept of necessary censorship in his *Republic*. But he differs from most of our latter-day self-styled moralists and vigilantes, for Plato is most concerned with the Homeric portrait of the Olympians as exaggerated reflections of human beings with human weaknesses. Though their erotic escapades are obviously to be included in his censure, Plato is not a hunter of obscene words and books in the modern sense.

In Rome, by contrast, there were people who claimed to find obscenity in specific words. There was a clash of opinion between the Stoics who believed in absolute frankness of expression, and others who thought that there should be some restraint in language. Cicero discusses this issue in a private letter written in 45 B.C.: he takes a middle course, agreeing with the opponents of Stoic bluntness, but ridiculing the excesses of some of them who detected elements of indecency in the most innocent of words.[18] It should be noted that, in choosing restraint, he says that he is following the "restraint of Plato". Finally, the case of Martial is instructive, and offers another contrast to modern conditions. Martial, as we have seen, is the Roman writer most given to using unrestrained language. In the preface to one of his volumes, however, he takes time out to claim that, although his subject matter is scabrous, his personal life is not (*lasciva est nostri pagina, vita proba est*). In other words, literature may be granted freedom of language, provided the author disassociates himself. This is quite different from our prevailing procedure, whereby an author has to be defended on the ground that his own experiences and background justify a particular theme or vocabulary.

There is no need to append a long summing-up. The early Christian thinkers, notably Tertullian, attacked Graeco-Roman literature for its alleged indecency, as well as for its basic devotion to the pre-Christian gods. Details are obscure, but the Church is certainly guilty of destroying many classical writings and works of art on moral grounds. The disappearance of the Milesian Tales and the like, and the loss of most of Petronius, can hardly be simple coincidence. Yet Martial's poems have been spared (by accident or design), as have many other examples of classical erotica. It would not be fair to claim that all early Christian thinking was of a piece. We recall the sympathetic picture of Jerome, struggling with his Ciceronian tastes in the belief that these

[18]Most of his examples lose their point in translation. I offer one of the more ridiculous. The Latin word *intercapedo* (interval) was allegedly objected to, because the last four letters contain the word *pedo* (to fart).

were conflicting with his Christian duties. It may also be conceded that there was some common ethical ground between Christian principles and such a pre-Christian philosophy as Stoicism. However, on the subject of Eros, the most influential Christian propagandists introduce a quite alien attitude. Paul's celebrated views on marriage and virginity, and the elaborations on these ideas by Augustine, provide the basis for our own suppression-morality. Paul, Corinthians 1, and the treatises *De Bono Conjugali* and *De Sancta Virginitate* by Augustine are the most important references. Both Paul and Augustine admit marriage to be a necessary institution, but make it clear that the unmarried person is in some way superior. Augustine regards sexual intercourse within marriage as having the essential purpose of procreation, but he does allow that marital sex for pure pleasure cannot be altogether condemned. Nevertheless, he is explicit in claiming that chastity is superior to even marital intercourse for procreation. Such ideas were quite novel. Physical chastity was not regarded as in any way important by pre-Christian Greeks and Romans, save in the case of such professionally pure figures as the Vestal Virgins. It is clear, for example, that the Greek word *parthenos* (virgin) and the Latin word *virgo* (virgin) could be applied to a married woman who was faithful to her husband. Physical abstention was not involved in this compliment.

Greek and Roman writers enjoyed more legal freedom than we do to treat of erotic themes. At times, they suffered much more than present-day writers, but only in terms of political censorship. Their artistic freedom derives from their religious ideas and mythologies, and from the existing general attitude that the State should not regulate the private lives of its citizens. It is notable that Plato, the advocate of strict State control over the individual, is one of the earliest advocates of literary censorship. We may subjoin to this the fact that the Greek State of Sparta, notorious for its subordination of the individual to the State, and idealised by Plato for that reason, produced virtually no literature or art in the period after the creation of the full-blooded Spartan system.

These observations cannot, however, be extended into a general principle. The idealising and sentimental approach to classical antiquity needs to be got rid of; the Greeks and Romans were tough-minded people, for the most part, and we do them no honour or credit by pretending otherwise. Nor do we achieve much by appealing to such slogans as "freedom". In our own day, many of our worst "moral" censors are precisely those people who yap the loudest about "freedom".

One thing can be said as a positive conclusion. The position of Eros in pre-Christian Greece and Rome was incontestably more respectable than in Christian Europe and North America. Augustine is perhaps more classical than Christian when in his celebrated prayer (in his

Confessions) he says: "Lord, give me chastity and continence, but not just yet."

SENECA

XVIII

SENECA AND PETRONIUS

All of this paper depends upon a premiss, and some of it comports a prejudice. I take the view that the author of the *Satyricon* is the arbiter of elegance described by Tacitus; also that the man was probably T. Petronius Niger, suffect consul in 62. As an addict of the Neronian date, I shall spend no time on the Antonine fancies of Marmorale and company; nor, though it would have been more worthwhile, had time allowed and had I been playing the dating game today, on the more recent effort of René Martin[1] to move the *Satyricon* down to the late Flavian period.

Having no taste for moralists who wear hair shirts made out of pure silk, I am somewhat averse from Annaeus Seneca, a character all too similar to Malcolm Muggeridge for my liking. True, all proper allowance must be made for circumstances. Never having lived under a tyranny, it is not for me to make glib criticisms of those who did. But it remains fair to judge a man by his own principles, and the discrepancy between Seneca's preaching and practise is often flagrant, despite the best efforts of his admirers.

As an example of what can happen here, take the letter in which Nero justified the murder of Agrippina to the senate. Miriam Griffin, in her important book[2] on Seneca, will say only that the philosopher "probably composed it", a reservation that ignores both Tacitus' statement that it brought Seneca into disrepute (*adverso rumore*) and the evidence of Quintilian who calls the letter a *scriptum Senecae*, adding a quotation from it.[3]

This is not to say that I swallow everything in Dio Cassius, much of whose version is conditioned by his own distaste for philosophers (evinced most blatantly in the speech concocted for Maecenas), and by anti-Senecan sources. But not all the latter were of the partisan and unreliable quality of Suillius' speech in 58.[4] Juvenal is neither level-headed nor often a trustworthy historical source, but it remains notable that for him Seneca is not merely *dives* but *praedives*.[5] And it is suggestive that, although their animadversions are upon his style rather than his career, the criticisms by Quintilian, Aulus Gellius, and Fronto are not mitigated by any reference to Seneca's life.[6]

Incidentally, although Romans from Caligula to Gellius strove to hit off nasty epigrams on Seneca's style, none approached that masterpiece of terseness reported in John Aubrey's *Brief Lives*: "Dr Kettle was wont to say that Seneca writes as a boare does pisse, *scilicet* by jerkes."

It is too often said that everything in Dio derives from Suillius. The calling in of the British loan in 61, for instance, is surely hinted at in the words *tam lato faenore* placed by Tacitus in Seneca's own mouth.[7] There were accounts biased in favour of Seneca,

* This paper was given, at the kind invitation of Professor Gareth Schmeling, to the Petronian Society at the 1979 meeting of the American Philogical Association in Boston. Some basic documentation, mainly for the primary sources, has been added for this published version.

most notably that of Fabius Rusticus.[8] Dio himself, suggestively in the context of Caligula rather than Nero, is influenced by these in describing Seneca as pre-eminent in σοφία and as an innocent victim of the emperor.[9] Some criticisms of Seneca at least will have been reasoned reactions to the eulogies by Rusticus.

Some currently popular scenarios are highly vulnerable, if not misguided. For notable instance, the one which has Seneca eclipsed in 62 and which includes Petronius among the *deteriores* to whom Nero was inclining at the time.[10] That Petronius should be so classified might be thought sobering, though it is not an impermissible notion. Now 62 may well have been a watershed year for the various court rivalries: Petronius Niger, Vibius Crispus, and Eprius Marcellus were all suffect consuls. But Seneca was a canny operator, quick-thinking and skilled in survival. It was he who improvised a way to prevent Agrippina from greeting the Armenian delegates.[11] And it was Seneca who, faced with a Nero maddened by the news of his mother's escape from drowning, was, after a—and we can believe it—*longum utriusque silentium, hactenus promptius* enough to put his colleague Burrus on the spot.[12]

Seneca did not lack for friends. His qualities of *comitas honesta* and *ingenium amoenum*[13] ensured that. Just as he was tipped off in 58 about the impending attack from Suillius, so also in 62 there were some who warned of the machinations against him.[14] We should beware in particular the idea that Seneca was weakened by the death of Burrus. That is due to a typically over-sensationalised opening by Tacitus to a new stretch of narrative. His claim that *mors Burri infregit Senecae potentiam* is at odds with an earlier (*Ann.* 13.2.2) assertion that the pair *ex aequo pollebant.*[15]

Indeed, it is even possible that Seneca had a hand in the selection of one of Burrus' successors, namely Faenius Rufus. The year 62 is a curious one for the advancement of an old associate of Agrippina, especially when her protégés Seneca and Burrus are allegedly liquidated. Faenius might well have seemed attractive in Seneca's eyes. This would tie in with Dio's[16] version of the conspiracy of 65 as an enterprise of Seneca and Faenius Rufus, not of Piso.

Seneca clearly was not impoverished by his supposed fall in 62. Two years later, according to Dio,[17] he was in a position to make a generous offer of funds to assist the rebuilding of Rome after the Great Fire. Nor does the papyrus of October 25, 62, prove that his estates in Egypt were confiscated: the μισθωτής attested as being in charge could have been Seneca's agent, not the emperor's.[18]

After 62, Seneca was much less visible than before. He avoided large gatherings, pleaded ill-health, and devoted himself to philosophy. Some of these details are trotted out again two years later when Seneca is for a second time affecting to retire to avoid the stigma of association with the cultural plundering mission to Greece and Asia undertaken by the freedman Acratus and a pretender to philhellenism called Secundus Carrinas.[19] This time, Seneca alleges bad health, keeps himself largely to his quarters, and reverts to one of the diet-conscious regimens of his youth, fruit and water.

This near-doublet may evoke suspicion. Certainly, Seneca was not finished in 62. Far from it. Before the end of that same year, he had survived charges

(secret ones at that) of undue friendship with Piso laid by a (to us) mysterious Romanus. Seneca had lost none of his old knack: he hoisted the engineer with his own petard by reversing the charges upon Romanus![20]

Tacitus' own narrative may furnish a clue. The historian sums up Seneca's change of life-style in 62 in the words *instituta prioris potentiae commutat.* Seneca was henceforth less seen; it need not follow that he was less heard.

From the time of his escape from Caligula, Seneca was a survivor over nearly thirty years. Petronius was also adaptable. A combination of the literary pleasures to be had from the *Satyricon*, along with the modern tendency to see a satirist under a tyrant as a brave and unconventional figure, constantly misleads scholars into representing Petronius as a gallant outsider. Take, for example, the recent formulation of that fine critic, Gordon Williams:[21] "His death, like his writings, was a calculated insult to exemplary establishment figures like Seneca (and Lucan)." In point of fact, a dispassionate reading of the obituary notice in Tacitus (incidentally, dare we imagine where the Petronius industry would be without that necrology?) makes it quite clear that Petronius was devoted to being inside, not outside, the court circles, albeit Nero's surprise at his knowledge of the sexual goings-on shows that he did not make it to the bedrooms of power.

Petronius' suicide, for all its spectacular details in Tacitus and the smashing of his fluorspar wine-dipper reported by the elder Pliny[22] (and not forgetting *Quo Vadis*?), was not unique in its theatrical insouciance. An unarmed partisan of Sejanus died calmly after hours of apparently light conversation with friends; the last hours of Rubellius Plautus were devoted both to philosophy and physical exercise at midday; the witty and fascinating consular Vestinus (another victim of 66) gave a dinner party in his downtown house (staffed, Tacitus emphasises, by handsome young slaves), knowing that the soldiers were on their way.[23] Seneca's death, for that matter, had its theatrical elements derived from Plato's *Phaedo.* Indeed, it can almost be said that Petronius' suicide culminated a tradition of its own.[24]

As for the *Satyricon*, especially the *Cena.* Even if Nero is satirised on occasion (a time-honoured topic I happily eschew today), we know from Suetonius[25] how tolerant he was of much more direct insults. Remember too that Antistius Sosianus did get off with his life in the first *maiestas* trial of the reign (held, it should be recalled, in that thrill-packed year of 62), in spite of declaiming *probrosa adversus principem carmina.*[26] And despite what many books and articles claim,[27] Fabricius Veiento was not exiled after the second such trial just because of his squibs against senators and priests (which one imagines Nero would have enjoyed anyway). Tacitus[28] explicitly states that it was the supplementary charge of trafficking in offices which brought Nero into the prosecution.

There was usually someone around the court with a sharp tongue. On one level, the *scurra* Vatinus, with his crude "I hate you, Nero, because you are a senator."[29] At another (perhaps not much higher), the consular Vestinus, whose

relationship with Nero turned on his *acre ingenium* and *asperae facetiae*.[30] Petronius fits easily into this atmosphere, as does Seneca's claim[31] that Nero had had more frankness than servility from him.

And Nero was no shrinking violet. He could give back as good as he received, maybe better, since his *probrosum carmen* against Afranius Quintianus provoked that worthy to join Piso's conspiracy.[32] Less frequently remembered by scholars is the emperor's *Luscio* (The One-eyed Man), aimed at the praetor Clodius Pollio.[33]

Furthermore, the ridicule of freedmen in the *Cena* was about the safest possible topic for a satirist. Useful to Nero in that it would help to further the cause of blackening the reign of Claudius. Such comedy would also be congenial to Seneca. Miriam Griffin has demonstrated that he was not overly fond of freedmen. The most pertinent document is *Epistle* 27, cataloguing the follies of the ignoramus Calvisius Sabinus and, as we shall soon see, a letter often claimed as a model for one aspect of Trimalchio. The first and most cutting thing Seneca has to say about Calvisius is *et patrimonium habebat libertini et ingenium.*

Nor should it be assumed that Seneca and Petronius were natural enemies because of differing philosophical temperaments. Petronius was no textbook Epicurean. For his part, Seneca was not a narrow ideologue. No one will be surprised to find that Stoicism is by far the most commonly mentioned of the schools in his writings. But it can come as something of a shock to discover that Epicurus is referred to more frequently than any Stoic, usually with approval.[34]

It is obvious enough that Petronius moralised as well as satirised. In the case of Seneca, the converse is more to the point here. His *Letters*, in particular, are full of comic material. Also, no matter who wrote the extant *Ludus*, Seneca did compose an *Apocolocyntosis*; *en passant*, we may notice the quips on this subject both by Seneca's brother and by Nero.[35]

Hence the weakness of modern attempts to find concordances between the writings of Seneca and Petronius. It may be suggestive that almost all of this industry consists of finding references to Seneca in Petronius rather than vice versa. The game can of course be played the other way. A serviceable item might be Seneca's diatribe[36] against those who turn day into night and night into day, since Tacitus says of Petronius *illi dies per somnum, nox officiis et oblectamentis vitae transigebatur*. Yet Seneca's attack is too generalising to permit identification of any particular target. And it was a commonplace of rhetoric; its employment by such as the *Historia Augusta* [37] guarantees that.

Rose and Sullivan[38] furnish an abundance of possible concordances. There and elsewhere the three leading contenders seem to be: a) the mock funerals of Pacuvius (*Ep.* 12. 8) as the inspiration for Trimalchio's drunken obsequies; b) the aforementioned account of Calvisius Sabinus as the model for Trimalchio's literary gaffes; c) *Ep.* 47, on the need to treat slaves kindly, including letting them sit down to dinner, taken to be the basis for Trimalchio's allowing his slaves to do just that, and for his homily on the brotherhood of man.

None of these seem to me to be very compelling. Especially not the last. The

idea that slavery was an unnatural institution had a pedigree extending all the way back to the sophists.[39] By the first century A.D., it was commonplace; the elder Seneca[40] registers it as one of the themes of Albucius Silus, and the sadistic *matrona* of Juvenal's Sixth Satire ridicules it as threadbare and ubiquitous.[41] Nor was there anything un-Roman or revolutionary about slaves and masters dining together: it had been the custom of no less than the elder Cato![42]

Trimalchio is simply given the theme as an exercise in maudlin inconsistency; it comes neither logically nor convincingly from a master who had earlier damned his slaves as *putidissimi*. A more interesting question, I think, is where was Seneca in the great debate on punishment of slaves evoked by the murder of Pedanius Secundus in 61? He does not feature in Tacitus' account of it.[43]

As for the other two passages, I would echo the view of Martin Smith[44] that nothing compels us to believe that Petronius had no other source but Seneca for the notorious eccentricities of Pacuvius and Calvisius. Mock funerals would appear to have been something less than rare; elsewhere[45] Seneca mentions another practitioner of them back in the reign of Caligula. With respect to Calvisius, we can improve Smith's point by noting the very *literary* nature of Trimalchio's cultural *faux pas*. His type of muddle and forgetfulness was a prime characteristic of Theophrastus' Late Learner;[46] and Trimalchio was a *senex*.

Seneca does not appear to have played much if any part in the patronage and promotion of literature. Conceivably that is one reason why he is never mentioned in the *Dialogus* of Tacitus. His one formal link with literary activities in the *Annals* comes in the accusation by his detractors that he had taken to poetry (epigrams or plays?) only in rivalry to Nero. And, unless it reflects the military tone of Burrus, we cannot help noticing that back in 59 Nero's two advisers deemed charioteering less of a disgrace than imperial indulgence in song. There may be a dig here at certain other contemporaries; Piso and even Thrasea Paetus had sung and danced in public.[47]

Seneca's own writings, especially *Ep.* 88 on the liberal arts, disclose a distaste for music, painting, and wrestling—all hobbies of Nero.[48] He was scornful of some aspects of poetry, lyric in particular, and disdained grammar, mathematics, astronomy, and astrology.[49] This is hardly the stuff of which patrons of the arts are made.

The Lucan connection is a snare and a delusion. An immense amount of ink has been spilled over the question of Eumolpus' *Bellum Civile* and the *Pharsalia*.[50] I do not think that Petronius' confection is a fair copy showing Lucan how to do it, or a reactionary attack on modern epic. Eumolpus is a figure of fun, or worse, throughout the *Satyricon*: it is surely *his* effort that is being mocked.

Martin has assembled a number of interesting, sometimes striking, parallels between the Petronius piece and the *Punica* of Silius Italicus. One does not have to accept his re-dating of the *Satyricon* to be intrigued by this. Silius enjoyed advancement and notoriety under Nero; he was *consul ordinarius* in 68, at an unusually early age. According to the younger Pliny's sketch of his career,[51]

Silius' poetry was largely the product of his later years. But possibly he had begun to compose and recite in Nero's time, thus permitting some glancing blows at his verse in a *Satyricon* written in that reign.

Lucan and Silius were not the only practitioners of Roman epic. A fragment from Herculaneum (comprising 67 hexameters) on the war between Antony and Octavian has been assigned to the Neronian period by Bardon.[52] Furthermore, two extended elegiac sequences on the theme of civil war occur in the group of epigrams in the *Anthologia Latina* ascribed to Seneca himself.[53]

Eumolpus does not have to represent any particular individual. Nevertheless, I am attracted to the little-noticed suggestion by Rose[54] that he could be meant to remind the reader of Remmius Palaemon.[55] The two have several common traits, most notably rampant bi-sexuality and fluent extemporisation of verses. Remmius was one of Persius' instructors. And he was as successful at producing wine as whiners, selling some vineyards whose productivity he had greatly increased at four times their original price. The buyer? No less than Annaeus Seneca.[56]

Even if Lucan were Petronius' target, it does not follow that Seneca would be upset. Relations between uncle and nephew are problematic. Seneca never mentions Lucan by name (apart from a possible allusion to him as a baby),[57] nor are they ever formally linked by Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio, or the Vacca Life. Furthermore, it was possible to like the one and not the other. Persius and Lucan came to know and admire each other through the agency of Cornutus. But when Persius encountered Seneca later in life, he was not favourably impressed.[58]

Thanks to our restricted knowledge and possession of Roman literature, we run the risk of exaggerating the contemporary importance of Seneca and Petronius, at least as dominant figures. Other names and incidents need always to be kept in play. For instance, it is no surprise that the philhellene Nero would be susceptible to Greek influence. Thanks to the *Suda*,[59] we know of Alexander and Chaeremon, one of whom called the emperor "blood mixed with mud"; in what context we do not know, and the value of the notice is impaired by an identical story in Suetonius[60] about Tiberius. Then there was Menecrates, temptingly equatable with the character whose songs Trimalchio murdered. In Suetonius and Dio, Menecrates is an honoured intimate of the emperor;[61] by flagrant contrast, in the pseudo-Lucianic *Nero*, he is one of the interlocutors on the outside. Is this error on the author's part, or a sign that Menecrates was out of favour late in the reign?

No Roman held unchallangeable influence with Nero, not even Tigellinus who could not "get" Petronius until 66, who had to share top honours in that year with Nerva and Petronius Turpilianus, and who fades out before the end in 68. Then there is the future paragon Nerva. What had he done to attract such recognition? Best not to know, from his admirers' point of view. According to Martial,[62] he was playing the dangerous game of poetry, being hailed by Nero as the new Tibullus. This may imply that Nerva cultivated a genre ignored by the emperor. Equally fascinating is Petronius Turpilianus, especially on the

reckoning of Corbett[63] who suggests (without argument) that he was probably a brother of our author. In which case, we ask at once why he did not save the *elegantiae arbiter* in 66. Perhaps they enjoyed a Cain-Abel relationship.

Reconstructing the various nuances of influence and the jockeyings for position at Nero's court is a pastime akin to contemporary China-watching from wall posters (incidentally, what are we to make of the misspelled graffito of Seneca's name on a wall at Pompeii?).[64] There is so much that we do not know and cannot grasp. For instance, how did the dramatist Maternus break the influence of Vatinius the *scurra*, as claimed in the *Dialogus*?[65] Yet it is in these deeper and wider contexts that the Seneca-Petronius relationship must be assessed: to isolate them is to go very badly astray.

NOTES

1. 'Quelques Remarques concernant la Date du *Satiricon*,' *REL* 53 (1975) 182–224.
2. *Seneca: a Philosopher in Politics*—hereinafter referred to by author's name—(Oxford 1976) 102.
3. 8. 5. 18: *salvum me esse adhuc nec credo nec gaudeo.*
4. Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.42.
5. 10. 16.
6. Quintilian 10. 1. 125–31; Gellius 12. 2; Fronto, *Ad M. Ant. de orat.* (= Van den Hout 149).
7. *Ann.* 14. 53. 6, placed soon after the account of Boudicca's revolt, thus helping (intentionally or not) the reader to make the connection.
8. Tacitus, *Ann.* 13. 20: *sane inclinat ad laudes Senecae, cuius amicitia floruit.*
9. Dio 59. 19. 7.
10. Tacitus, *Ann.* 14. 52. 1.
11. *Ann.* 13. 5. 3; Dio 61. 3. 3 gives equal credit to Seneca and Burrus.
12. *Ann.* 14. 7. 4.
13. *Ann.* 13. 2–3.
14. *Ann.* 13. 43. 1 (*nec deerant qui haec . . . Senecae deferrent*); 14. 53. 1 (*prodentibus iis quibus aliqua honesti cura*).
15. *Ann.* 14. 52. 1; 13. 2. 2.
16. 62. 24. 1.
17. 62. 25. 3.
18. The papyrus is taken to be a proof of confiscation by G.M. Browne, 'Withdrawal from Lease,' *BASP* 5 (1968) 17, and by (e.g.) J.P. Sullivan, 'Petronius, Seneca, and Lucan: a Neronian literary feud,' *TAPA* 99 (1968) 457 n. 10; for reservations, cf. Griffin 293 n. 9.
19. Tacitus, *Ann.* 15. 45. 3–6. It is unclear whether Seneca was seeking to avoid the mission itself or association with the policy. Either way, the incident points to his continuing status.
20. For more on this, and the whole question of Seneca in 62 and thereafter, cf. my 'Seneca's *Potentia*,' *CP* 65 (1970) 187.
21. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley 1978) 288.
22. *NH* 37. 20.
23. Tacitus, *Ann.* 5. 6–7; 14. 59. 2–3; 15. 69. 2–3.
24. It is pertinent to recall the many discussions of suicide in Seneca's writings (for a conspectus, cf. A.L. Motto, *Guide to the Thought of Lucius Annaeus Seneca* (Amsterdam 1970) 206–7), especially his account of the death of his friend Marcellinus, *Ep.* 77, 5–10.
25. *Nero* 39. 1–2.
26. Tacitus, *Ann.* 14. 48. 1; for this and the following trial of Veiento, cf. my 'Executions, Trials, and Punishment in the Reign of Nero,' *Parola del Passato* 117 (1967) 435.
27. E.g., Sullivan, *art. cit.* 454 n. 5.
28. *Ann.* 14. 50. 2.
29. Dio 62. 15. 1; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15. 34. 3.
30. *Ann.* 15. 52. 4; 15. 68. 4.

31. *Ann.* 15. 61. 3.
32. *Ann.* 15. 49. 5.
33. Suetonius, *Dom.* 1. 1.
34. See the statistics assembled in Motto, *op. cit.* x–xxiii.
35. Dio 60. 35. 3–4.
36. *Ep.* 122. 2: *sunt qui officia lucis noctisque perverterint.*
37. *Elag.* 28. 6: *transegit et dierum actus noctibus et nocturnos diebus.*
38. K.F.C. Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leiden 1971) 69–74; J.P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius* (Bloomington 1968) 129–38.
39. See Griffin 256–85 for a full and admirable account of Seneca on slavery, including the history of his ideas.
40. *Controv.* 7. 6. 18.
41. 6. 222: *o demens, ita servus homo est? nil fecerit, esto*; cf. Mayor's note on 14. 16.
42. Plutarch, *Cato* 3. 2.
43. *Ann.* 14. 42–5; Tacitus notes that no one ventured to stand up and oppose the hard line of Cassius, albeit *dissonae voces* expressing pity were audible.
44. In his edition of the *Cena* (Oxford 1975) 217–9.
45. *De brev. vit.* 20. 3.
46. *Charact.* 27; Trimalchio shares other habits (dancing, for instance) with the Theophrastean opsimath.
47. Tacitus, *Ann.* 15. 65. 2; 16. 21. 1.
48. Suetonius, *Nero* 52–3.
49. *Ep.* 88 is seminal for most of this; cf. Motto, *op. cit.*, 120–1, 171, for other passages.
50. I would single out P.A. George, 'Petronius and Lucan *De Bello Civili*,' *CQ* N.S. 24 (1974) 119 for his incisive demolition of much nonsense.
51. *Ep.* 3. 7.
52. *La Littérature Latine Inconnue* 2 (Paris 1956) 136–7; text in *Anth. Lat.* 1. 1.
53. *Anth. Lat.* 1. 462–3.
54. *Op. cit.*, 80–1.
55. Suetonius, *De gramm.* 23.
56. Pliny, *NH* 14. 51.
57. *Consol. ad Helv.* 18. 5; cf. Griffin 58.
58. Suetonius, *Vit. Pers.*
59. A 1128 (Adler).
60. *Tib.* 57. 1; it is not clear from the *Suda* exactly who came out with the remark, nor whether it was intended as a jest or a serious criticism.
61. Suetonius, *Nero* 30. 2; Dio 63. 1. 1.
62. 8. 70. 7; cf. 9. 26. 1.
63. P. Corbett, *Petronius* (New York 1970) 142 n. 4. It is worth noting that his father, the consular of 19, is one of the only two ancestors of living people to be attacked in the *Ludus de morte Claudii* (14. 2); cf. Griffin 453–4.
64. *CIL* 4.4418; is it to be connected with Seneca's unexplained trip to Pompeii (*Ep.* 70. 1), or seen as a provincial reaction to something involving Seneca in Rome?
65. *Dial.* 11. 2; it is notable that Vatinius was *studiorum quoque sacra profanantem.*

XIX

EXECUTIONS UNDER CLAUDIUS: SENECA'S *LUDUS DE MORTE CLAUDII*

THE MALICIOUS PASQUINADE known as the *Ludus de morte Claudii* or the *Apocolocyntosis*, ascribed by tradition to the philosopher Seneca, has long exercised the ingenuity of scholars. The glaring contradiction between this skit and the flatteries heaped on Claudius in the *Ad Polybium* has prompted some to deny the authenticity of one or the other of these pieces. It seems today that the *Ludus* (as I shall style it for brevity's sake) has won acceptance from many distinguished scholars as genuinely emanating from the pen of Seneca.[1] Although the question of authorship is important, I prefer to devote most of this paper to the question—what is the purpose of the *Ludus*? I agree with Scramuzza that, "More than a humorous skit, the *Apocolocyntosis* seems then to be a party manifesto. This aspect of the problem should not be lost sight of in appraising its contribution to the history."[2]

I focus attention on one particular aspect of the *Ludus*. In addition to the usual mockeries of Claudius' physical and alleged mental deficiencies, his Lyons origin, his extensions of the citizenship, and devotion to pettifogging lawyers,[3] there are quite a number of specific references to people executed in his reign. If we accept the standpoint of Scramuzza, these references ought to have been deliberately selected by the author of the skit for some purpose. These individual cases all lead up to the prosecution of Claudius under the *Lex Cornelia* before Aeacus, where he is charged with having executed thirty-five senators, two hundred and twenty-one Roman knights, and a multitude of others (*occisos senatores* XXXV, *equites R.* CCXXI, *ceteros ὅσα ψάμαθος τε κόνις τε*); the accusation is brought by Pompeius Pedo.[4] My purpose is to examine each of these individual cases, document them where possible from Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio, and try to establish why the author selected them.

[1]For detailed discussions see: A. Momigliano, *Claudius, the Emperor and his Achievement*[2] (Oxford 1961) 74ff.; V. Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius* (Cambridge, Mass. 1940) 5–11; R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 336 and 539, does not dispute the Senecan tradition. I am most grateful to Mary E. White, editor of *Phoenix*, for reminding me that G. Bagnani has dealt with the subject in his *Arbiter of Elegance* (Toronto 1954) 27–46, and indeed anticipated many of my points of detail. I regret that I have been unable to consult the article on the *Apocolocyntosis* by F. A. Todd in *CQ* 37 (1943) 103–107.

[2]Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius* 9.

[3]*Ludus* 12. The only mourners for Claudius are said to be *Agatho et pauci causidici.*

[4]*Ludus* 14.

The first reference is to the murder of Claudius' son-in-law Silanus, made by one of the Olympians during the debate on Claudius' application for deification.[5] The first documented attack on Claudius' executions is put into the mouth of the deified Augustus; the choice of Augustus may or may not be of special significance.[6] His first charge is that Claudius murdered his two great-grand-daughters Julia, one by the sword, the other by starvation; and one great-grandson, L. Silanus (*ut duas Julias proneptes meas occideret, alteram ferro, alteram fame; unum abnepotem L. Silanum*). Suetonius (*Claud.* 29) identifies these as the daughters of Drusus and Germanicus respectively and adds that Claudius *crimine incerto nec defensione ulla data occidit.* Of Julia, daughter of Drusus, Tacitus says *dolo Messalinae interfectam* (*Ann.* 13.32). Dio confirms this, adding that Messalina had her put to death out of jealousy in 43 (Dio. 60.18.4). However, in his description of the trial of P. Suillius, the notorious prosecutor of Claudius' reign, held in 58, Tacitus lists Julia amongst his victims, and Nero rejects the plea of Suillius that he had prosecuted these victims under orders from Claudius; Suillius then claims to have acted under orders from Messalina, but this second plea is also disallowed (*Ann.* 13.43). I shall revert to the trial of Suillius later. The banishment of Julia daughter of Germanicus by Claudius is referred to by Tacitus (*Ann.* 14.63); Dio (60.8.5) records that she was accused of adultery with Seneca, exiled, and executed at the instigation of the jealous Messalina.

The case of L. Silanus is linked by Suetonius with those of the Julias (*loc. cit.*). His words are: *Silanus abdicare se praetura ante* IIII. *Kal. Jan. morique initio anni coactus die ipso Claudii et Agrippinae nuptiarum.* Tacitus has a full account (*Ann.* 12.3,4,8). Agrippina wanted to get rid of Silanus who was betrothed by Claudius to Octavia and who had been given the praetorship ahead of the legal age (Dio. 60.31.7) so that Nero might then be betrothed to Octavia. She made L. Vitellius the agent of her plot. The choice was deliberate. Vitellius' son was married to Junia Calvina, sister of Silanus and a woman described as *sane decora et procax*; Vitellius persuaded Claudius that Silanus had had incestuous relations with his sister. In view of Claudius' current preoccupation with the legality of his marriage to Agrippina, the charge was a carefully calculated one. Claudius, no doubt welcoming a chance to show Rome that he was sternly opposed to incest, accepted the charge, cancelled Silanus' betrothal to Octavia, and forced him to resign his praetorship which had only one day to run (note the slight discrepancy with Suetonius

[5]*Ludus* 8. The reference is in the form of a cruel jest: *Silanum enim generum suum occidit propterea quod sororem suam, festivissimam omnium puellarum, quam omnes Venerem vocarent, maluit Iunonem vocare.*

[6]Momigliano, *Claudius* 77ff., regards this as the "real kernel of the attack on Claudius."

on this point). This *reliquus praeturae dies* was filled by Eprius Marcellus, the famous delator of subsequent reigns. Tacitus records that Silanus committed suicide on Claudius' wedding day in the following words: *die nuptiarum Silanus mortem sibi conscivit, sive eo usque spem vitae produxerat, seu delecto die augendam ad invidiam.* Tacitus is making full use of the stylistic possibilities offered by the macabre situation in which a man convicted of incest dies on the day of a royal wedding which to many Romans was itself incestuous. One wonders if Silanus' sense of humour was as grim as that of Tacitus.[7]

Augustus then apostrophises Claudius for putting people to death without trial,[8] before citing more names. The first of these is, of all people, Messalina. Her execution is regarded as a crime and no mention is made of her own crimes and executions. This is an important point which will be developed later. Next are grouped together *in una domo*, as victims of Claudius, Crassus, Magnus, Scribonia, the Tristioniae, and Assario; all of these are described as *nobiles*, and Crassus is acidly observed to have been idiot enough to be emperor (*tam fatuum, ut etiam regnare posset*).[9]

Suetonius (*loc. cit.*) mentions the case of Pompeius. He was known as Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus, and was butchered *in concubitu dilecti adulescentuli*. Tacitus (*Hist.* 1.48.1) records his execution without comment. Dio (60.29.6a) claims that his death was engineered by Messalina. Crassus was M. Licinius M.f. Crassus Frugi, Scribonia being his wife.[10] The Tristioniae and Assario are not mentioned in the extant parts of the *Annals*, nor in Suetonius and Dio.

Augustus then frames his amended motion, which is tantamount to an indictment: *quandoquidem divus Claudius occidit socerum suum Appium Silanum, generos duos Magnum Pompeium et L. Silanum, socerum filiae Crassum Frugi, hominem tam sibi similem quam ovo ovum, Scriboniam socrum filiae suae, uxorem suam Messalinam et ceteros quorum numerus iniri non potuit, placet mihi in eum severe animadverti.* Again, note the inclusion of Messalina as an innocent victim. The new name in this list is Appius Silanus. Suetonius (*Claud.* 37) says that he was destroyed by Messalina and Narcissus in collusion (*conspirassent perdere*); they terrified Claudius by claiming to have had dreams in which Appius attacked him, adding that Appius (who had been summoned to appear at a given time) was trying to force his way into audience with Claudius. Dio has

[7]Dio (60.31.7) and Suetonius (*Claud.* 27 and 29) say that Silanus was forced to suicide by Claudius.

[8]*Ludus* 10: *dic mihi, dive Claudi, quare quemquam ex his, quos quasque occidisti, antequam de causa cognosceres, antequam audires, damnasti?*

[9]We do not know whether Crassus deserved this slight. The joke is repeated in *Ludus* 11 in the words *tam similem sibi quam ovo ovum.*

[10]See Syme, *Tacitus* 385.

the same account (60.14.3). Tacitus' full account is lost, but elsewhere he imputes this crime to the freedman Narcissus, using the dramatic phrase *Appianae caedis molitor Narcissus* (*Ann.* 11.29).

Claudius is then led down to Hades where he is met by Narcissus; the latter is said to have gone down beforehand by a short-cut to meet his master (*antecesserat iam compendiaria ad patronum excipiendum*). This seems to be a reference to the forced suicide of Narcissus shortly after the accession of Nero, an important event which I discuss later. Claudius is met by a host of victims. These are:

C. Silius: the fellow conspirator and paramour of Messalina; he needs no introduction.

Juncus praetorius: Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.35) mentions a senator Juncus Vergilianus who was executed for his part in the plot.

Sextus Traulus: described as an *eques*. Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.36) mentions the vain appeal against his death sentence by Traulus Montanus, describing him as *modesta iuventa, sed corpore insigni.*

M. Helvius: otherwise unknown.

Trogus: Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.35) mentions a Saufeius Trogus, executed as a plotter.

Cotta: otherwise unknown.

Vettius Valens: famous in Tacitus as the man who climbed the tree during the nuptial revels of Silius and Messalina and called out the prophetic words *tempestatem ab Ostia atrocem* (*Ann.* 11.31). His is the first name denounced to Claudius by Narcissus as a former paramour of Messalina (*Ann.* 11.30). He was executed despite a confession (*Ann.* 11.35).

Fabius: otherwise unknown.

The last six named above are described as *equites quos Narcissus duci iusserat.* Furneaux (*ad loc.*) notes that Tacitus adds the names of Titius Proculus, Pompeius Urbicus, Decrius Calpurnianus, and Sulpicius Rufus, and that he omits Cotta and Fabius.

One other person is included in this list, the pantomime Mnester. This fellow is familiar to historians of the period; I need only add that Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.36) says that his appeal for clemency on the grounds that he had followed Messalina under compulsion (he displayed whip marks to underline this) and would himself have become the first victim had Silius become Emperor, nearly persuaded Claudius to pardon him, but the freedmen were hostile to him and hardened Claudius against him.

The final group of victims are said to throng around Messalina, who again is introduced without comment. First come the freedmen Polybius, Myron, Harpocras, Amphaeus, and Pheronactus. Of these we may document:

Polybius: the recipient of Seneca's *De Consolatione*. He is not mentioned in the extant parts of the *Annals*. Suetonius (*Claud.* 28)

claims that he *saepe inter duos consules ambulabat.* Dio. (61.1.3) says that he was attacked in the theatre, also that his death was engineered by Messalina who thereby forfeited all confidence in herself and her fidelity (60.31.2).

Harpocras: Suetonius (*Claud.* 28) says: *Harpocran, cui lectica per urbem vehendi spectaculaque publice edendi ius tribuit.*

Along with the freedmen are linked two Prefects, Justus Catonius and Rufrius Pollius. Furneaux (*ad Ann.* 1.29) equates the former with the Justus Catonius there mentioned as a *primi ordinis centurio*; Dio (60.18.3) says that he was executed by Messalina in 43 to prevent him denouncing her adulteries to Claudius. Then some of Claudius' *amici* appear. These are Saturninus Lusius, mentioned by Tacitus in his list of Suillius' victims; Pedo Pompeius who serves Claudius with the indictment under the *Lex Cornelia* but who seems not to be in Tacitus, Suetonius, or Dio; Lupus, who is probably the Cornelius Lupus listed by Tacitus as a Suillius victim, and Celer Asinius. All these are said to be of consular rank.

Finally, it should be mentioned that Claudius eventually finds only one supporter at his trial. This is P. Petronius who is introduced as *vetus convictor eius, homo Claudiana lingua disertus.* This slighting reference conceals the distinguished services of Petronius as Proconsul of Asia and as legate in Syria under Gaius.[11]

In all thirty victims are named (counting the Tristioniae as one). Of these, six (the two Julias, Pompeius Magnus, Appius Silanus, Polybius, Justus Catonius) are known from the evidences of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio (separately or together) to have been the victims of Messalina. To these may be added Saturninus Lusius and Cornelius Lupus, victims of Suillius, insomuch as Suillius was the agent of Messalina's accusation against Valerius Asiaticus (*Ann.* 11.1ff). Nine more are victims of the executions following the Silius–Messalina plot. Then there is Messalina herself. Lucius Silanus was the victim of Agrippina. The others cannot be classified as victims of any particular influence, for want of evidence from Tacitus, Suetonius, or Dio.

Why were these cases singled out by the writer of the *Ludus*? Great difficulties face any interpretation. It is self-evident that the *Ludus* is intended to blacken Claudius, but what specific purpose is being served? A common suggestion is that it is intended to ingratiate the author with Agrippina. But in this case why is Messalina so lightly treated? She is mentioned three times, always as one of Claudius' victims, and no attempt is made to associate her with her own executions. Her most famous victim, Valerius Asiaticus, is omitted from the list altogether, and this is surely deliberate. It is very hard to believe that Seneca, if he

[11]See Syme, *Tacitus* 386; Furneaux, *ad Ann.* 3.49.

wrote the *Ludus*, would have any desire to salve the reputation of Messalina; after all, he had been one of her victims, whether guilty or innocent of adultery with Julia.

Who would want the impossible task of whitewashing Messalina? There are one or two hints from Tacitus that the activities of Agrippina were such as to make people believe that even Messalina's death was to be regretted. In 51 Agrippina replaced the praetorian prefects Rufrius Crispinus and Lucius Geta, *quos memores Messalinae et liberis eius devinctos credebat* (*Ann.* 12.42), by Burrus. Crispinus had been the official who took troops to Baiae *tanquam opprimendo bello* to arrest Asiaticus, but he played no part in the downfall of Messalina. His colleague Geta was notably reluctant to take firm action against Messalina (*Ann.* 11.33). Furthermore, Tacitus' contrast between the influences of Messalina and Agrippina hints that the former was being regretted by some.[12] Now Messalina herself was no fit candidate for rehabilitation, but in a negative way the playing down of her crimes might be a tactic of the partisans of Britannicus, her son by Claudius, undertaken that his chances might not be affected by the notoriety of his mother, for Britannicus was a very popular figure with sections of the army and the people.[13]

The prime mover of the destruction of Messalina was the freedman Narcissus. This point is stressed in the *Ludus* where he rather than Claudius is cited as the murderer of Silius and his fellow conspirators. After the death of Messalina Narcissus became Claudius' main prop. His complicity with Messalina in crimes such as the death of Appius Silanus was tactfully forgotten. The author of the *Ludus* is patently hostile to Narcissus and so does not recall Messalina's part in this affair. Dio (61.34.4) says that Agrippina was only able to compass the murder of Claudius because Narcissus was in Campania taking the waters for his gout. Tacitus (*Ann.* 13.1) records the indecent haste with which Agrippina forced Narcissus to suicide, adding that Nero regretted this because he would have found Narcissus' extravagances congenial. Tacitean malice may well veil quite different reasons for Nero wanting to retain such a powerful enemy of his mother.[14]

Another point. If the *Ludus* is meant to attract Agrippina, why is so much play made with the death of her victim L. Silanus. The macabre

[12] *Ann.* 12.7: *versa . . . civitas et cuncta feminae oboediebant, non per lasciviam, ut Messalina, rebus Romanis inludenti. adductum et quasi virile servitium.*

[13] Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.69, says that when Nero was presented to the Guards by Burrus there were some voices raised in favour of Britannicus. Narcissus tried to elevate Britannicus above Nero, though with little hope of success (*Ann.* 12.65). See also *Ann.* 13.15, where Nero is alarmed that Britannicus *favorem late quaesivisset.*

[14] *Ann.* 13.1: *nec minus properato Narcissus Claudii libertus, de cuius iurgiis adversus Agrippinam rettuli, aspera custodia et necessitate extrema ad mortem agitur, invito principe, cuius abditis adhuc vitiis per avaritiam ac prodigentiam mire congruebat.*

circumstances of Silanus' alleged incest and the dubious legality of her marriage to Claudius would surely have kept this case fresh in the minds of all at Rome. A tactful writer would have omitted reference to this incident, as Asiaticus had been passed over, yet the *Ludus* has no less than three references to Silanus' death!

The authorship, date, and publication of the *Ludus* are questions which may be relevantly introduced at this juncture. Dio tells us (60.35) that Seneca composed an ἀποκολοκύντωσις, but in the *Ludus* no such transmogrification of Claudius occurs. This point has been dismissed as a valid argument against identifying the two pieces,[15] but it is still worth keeping in mind. It seems clear that it was composed after the deification of Claudius and after the suicide of Narcissus. Tacitus does not say that Seneca composed any such skit. It is never easy to interpret such silences on his part. Syme[16] points out that Tacitus fails to mention the *Satyricon* of Petronius, and indeed hardly mentions Seneca's more celebrated literary works. Yet Syme seems a little desperate in saying: "Tacitus could not mention Seneca's pasquinade on Divus Claudius. That was alien to the dignity of history." Tacitus takes pleasure in pointing out that Seneca composed Nero's official elogium for Claudius (as does Dio), describing it as *oratio a Seneca composita multum cultus praeferret, ut fuit illi viro ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum* (*Ann.* 13.3). He notes with malice that laughter greeted the official references to Claudius' *providentiam sapientiamque*. Does this imply that members of the audience laughed because they knew of a very different attitude in a skit by Seneca? Perhaps, but in this case Tacitus would seem to have missed a good chance to exercise his own grim humour or his capacity for epigram. And it is worth pointing out that the official references to Claudius' birth, his ancestors' high offices and triumphs, his literary works, and absence of disasters in his reign, were received quietly by the same audience, though the *Ludus* ridicules both Claudius' birth and literary creations. This Tacitean picture does not give the impression of an audience of *cognoscenti* enjoying an official elogium composed by a Seneca whom they knew to have circulated a malicious counterblast to his own public effusions.

If composed very soon after the deification, the *Ludus* must have been circulated in secrecy. The official atmosphere of the early years of Nero's reign would not permit such a skit on the deified Claudius. We cannot accept the statement of Suetonius (*Nero* 33) that Nero began to insult Claudius' memory almost at once. Tacitus gives a very different picture. It is true that he describes Nero's official grief as counterfeited (*Ann.* 13.4: *tristitiae imitamentis*), but we are dealing with official attitudes only. The famous trial of Suillius is the most pertinent example.

[15]Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius* 227, n. 3, deals with this and other views.
[16]*Tacitus* 539, n. 1.

Publius Suillius Rufus came to prominence in 24 when, after serving Germanicus as quaestor, he was convicted for bribe-taking (*pecuniam ob rem iudicandam cepisse*), and was exiled from Italy. Tiberius proposed his relegation to an island in the national interest. With typical relish, Tacitus comments that this was badly received at the time, but later, after the return of Suillius, was praised, because Suillius rose to prominence under Claudius as a powerful and venal friend of the Emperor, enjoying a friendship that was long but never worthy.[17] He next appears in the *Annals* as the accuser of Valerius Asiaticus with Sosibius, Britannicus' tutor, as assistant.[18] Tacitus implies that Suillius was a willing tool of Messalina, but it is notable that the reported last words of Asiaticus blame only Messalina and Vitellius for his downfall; also Tacitus makes no mention of Suillius receiving any official reward for his prosecution, although Rufus Crispinus and Sosibius were richly rewarded.[19] Suillius continued his prosecutions with great zeal and gained a great following according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.5). He is alleged to have taken bribes from both sides in a case involving a certain Samius (*insignis eques Romanus*) who committed suicide at Suillius' house after finding his own bribe of 400,000 sesterces inadequate. Samius deserves few tears from posterity, but his demise sparked off a campaign led by C. Silius for the abolition of money payments and gifts to barristers.[20] The campaign was hardly disinterested; Silius was intending to muzzle Suillius and he made Suillius the object of his fierce attacks.[21] Silius may have been avenging Samius, but it is more likely that he feared the influence of Suillius over Messalina and Claudius. Suillius appealed to Claudius who effected a compromise by fixing a maximum fee of 10,000 sesterces.

In 58 Suillius was brought to trial. Tacitus tells the story in some detail (*Ann.* 13.42–43). His power under Claudius is recalled in dark terms,[22] and he is said to be too powerful in Nero's reign for the comfort of his many enemies. It is significant that the agent of Messalina against Asiaticus was still such an important figure; we may recall that his subordinate Sosibius had been got rid of by Agrippina very soon after her marriage to Claudius. The instigator of the prosecution of Suillius was Seneca. Tacitus reports that the unpopularity of Suillius did not

[17] *Ann.* 4.31: *quem vidit sequens aetas praepotentem, venalem et Claudii principis amicitia diu prospere, numquam bene usum.*

[18] Dio (40.32.5) says that Agrippina put Sosibius to death soon after her marriage to Claudius. Furneaux (*ad Ann.* 11.1) thinks he was a freedman.

[19] *Ann.* 11.4. Crispinus was voted *sestertium quindecies et insignia praeturae.* Vitellius proposed the award of *sestertium decies* to Sosibius.

[20] *Ann.* 11.5, where Tacitus connects Samius' death and Silius' campaign by the word *igitur.*

[21] *Ann.* 11.6: *discors Suillio Silius acriter incubuit.*

[22] *imperitante Claudio terribilis ac venalis.*

prevent Seneca from incurring some odium in his prosecution, and records (in indirect speech) Suillius' spirited counterattack. He was bold enough to recall that he had been quaestor to Germanicus, whilst Seneca had seduced Julia—an excellent debating point. Suillius was formally charged with extortion whilst governor of Asia and with embezzlement of public monies. This charge was obviously designed to recall his conviction under Tiberius. However, whilst the customary year for collecting evidence for this prosecution was under way, Suillius' enemies brought fresh charges which could be testified to immediately by witnesses. He was now accused of driving Q. Pomponius into civil war, of causing the deaths of Julia daughter of Drusus, Poppaea Sabina (mother of Nero's Poppaea), Valerius Asiaticus, Lusius Saturninus, Cornelius Lupus, and in general terms *equitum Romanorum agmina damnata omnemque Claudii saevitiam*. The prosecution was aiming to use Suillius as a scapegoat for the Claudian period. They were not on safe ground, for Nero had given no official intimation that attacks on Claudius' memory would be well received. Yet Suillius took the line that Claudius had driven him to all his accusations, a risky defence and probably only undertaken to hoist the prosecution with their own petard. Nero intervened and claimed that a perusal of Claudius' papers showed no record of organising prosecutions. Suillius then turned to blaming Messalina, thinking that here was safer ground. Everyone was possibly surprised when this defence broke down. An important principle was enunciated; the instruments of crimes must be punished as well as the instigators.[23] One might feel that Suillius had no chance. But his fate must have sadly disappointed his prosecutors and Seneca. Half his estate was confiscated, but his son Nerullinus and granddaughter were allowed to inherit the other half. Suillius went to a comfortable exile in the Balearic islands.[24] The disappointed prosecutors attempted to impeach Nerullinus for extortion, but were frustrated by the veto of Nero.

The case of Suillius is important for any analysis of the political motives of the *Ludus*. It shows that, four years after Claudius' death, it was unwise to prosecute his memory by impeaching prominent men of his reign. This makes it almost unthinkable that the *Ludus* was openly published in this period. It also intensifies the difficulties of the ascription to Seneca. Enmity between Suillius and Seneca must have dated back to the affair of Julia in Tiberius' day. If Seneca wrote the *Ludus*, why

[23] *puniendos rerum atrocium ministros, ubi pretia scelerum adepti scelera ipsa aliis delegent.*

[24] *in insulas Balearis pellitur, non in ipso discrimine, non post damnationem fractus animo; ferebaturque copiosa et molli vita secretum illud toleravisse.* It is also worth noting that his son Caesoninus, although involved in the Messalina–Silius plot, was spared by Claudius and Narcissus. Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.36) relishes the reason: *Caesoninus vitiis protectus est, tanquam in illo foedissimo coetu passus muliebria.*

did he not include Suillius along with Narcissus as one of the villains of the reign? And we are brought back to the signal omission of Valerius Asiaticus from the *Ludus*, an omission not outweighed by brief inclusion of three of Suillius' alleged victims (Julia, Lusius Saturninus, Cornelius Lupus).

If Seneca wrote the *Ludus*, his selection of cases is inept. Victims of Messalina, Messalina herself with Silius and fellow conspirators, the outstanding victim of Agrippina, all these are used indiscriminately to point to the cruelty of Claudius. Even if mockery of Claudius were the only aim, the *Ludus* is not very successful. As a political weapon, the only bias that obtrudes is a playing down of Messalina's executions and the condemnation of Narcissus as Claudius' most nefarious henchman. It contains no obvious aid to Agrippina; the references to L. Silanus would greatly embarrass her. If Seneca wrote the skit, he missed nearly every opportunity to take revenge on Suillius and his enemies, and if the skit became public, at least between 54 and 58, it would not have endeared him to Nero. And if the skit had appeared between the suicide of Narcissus and the murder of Britannicus, and the mild treatment of Messalina had been designed to bolster favour for Britannicus, Nero would have been obviously furious.

Summing up. If Seneca did write the *Ludus*, then I think my evidence shows that it cannot have been written for the commonly alleged political motives. On the basis of the points adduced throughout this paper, I feel sure that Seneca was not the author of our *Ludus*. I reiterate my view that the *Ludus* is a political squib, of very indifferent merit, that it could not have been openly published before 58, and that it might tentatively be regarded as being pro-Britannicus, secretly circulating during the manoeuvres to elevate Britannicus, certainly not composed to please Nero.

XX

SENECA'S *POTENTIA*

With respect to "mors Burri infregit Senecae potentiam" (Tac. *Ann.* 14. 52. 1), D. C. A. Shotter has recently argued for the truth of Tacitus' statement against G. Walter's doubts ("Two Notes on Nero," *CP*, LXIV [1969], 109 ff.).[1] His arguments are not conclusive. The Tacitean picture of the deterioration of Nero's reign after the death of the supposed paragon Burrus does not stand up to investigation.[2] After Seneca's interview with Nero and retirement from the court, Tacitus describes him as *perculso* (*Ann.* 14. 17. 1), yet he can still survive secret charges concerning his friendship with Piso which were laid by a mysterious

1. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), p. 591 says much the same, although he slightly qualifies the claim in his note *ad loc.*

2. For Burrus, and the consequences of his death, see my article "Executions, Trials, and Punishment in the Reign of Nero," *Parola del passato*, CXVII (1967) 425 ff.

Romanus.[3] It may be significant that the same word *perculsus* is used to describe Romanus' discomfiture: In 64, Seneca was still able to outlive his refusal to join two alleged villains on a mission of temple plundering in Asia and Greece by pleading ill-health,[4] and it was not easy to incriminate Seneca in the Pisonian conspiracy; only the *eques* Antonius Natalis showed any willingness to provide evidence (*Ann.* 15. 60–61).

It is also wrong to assume that Seneca's position was fatally weakened by Burrus' two successors. The division of authority was not novel; Burrus himself had replaced two men in 51 (see my article [cited n.2] p. 430). Tigellinus is too familiar to be documented here. Faenius Rufus, however, has remarkable importance.[5] Tacitus claims that he was appointed "ex vulgi favore, quia rem frumentariam sine quaestu tractabat" (*Ann.* 14. 51). This elevation had occurred in 55, thanks to Agrippina (*ibid.* 10. 22). The year 62 is a curious one for the advancement of an old associate of Agrippina. It is not impossible that Seneca had a hand in his appointment; the two were certainly associates up to the unmasking of the Pisonian conspiracy.[6] Burrus and Seneca were both protégés, albeit ungrateful ones, of Agrippina. Faenius might well have seemed an attractive successor to Burrus in Seneca's eyes. The hope was doomed. As soon as Seneca was *perculso*, Faenius was attacked for his old connection with Agrippina,[7] yet Faenius, like Seneca, is not liquidated until 65, after the collapse of Piso's plot. It is equally noteworthy that Piso survived until 65, although friendship with him was deemed suspicious as early as 62. The final behavior of Faenius is despicable, but his actions are those of a desperate man struggling to save his own skin. There is no evidence that he had any wish to see Seneca die; Seneca and Burrus showed an equally natural concern with their own skins during Nero's murder of Agrippina (*Ann.* 14. 7; see Baldwin, *loc. cit.*, n. 2, p. 432). Faenius is an enigmatic figure in Tacitus. He is introduced with the stigma of *segnem innocentiam* (*Ann.* 14. 51), but this is later transmuted into the accolade *vita famaque laudatum*.[8]

It can be conceded that Seneca's position was weakened by the death of Burrus. But *infregit potentiam* is without warrant. Had Faenius proved a stronger personality than Tigellinus, Seneca might have waxed as influential as before. It was not usual for a man's *potentia* to be suddenly destroyed by one particular event under Nero. The Emperor was slow to move against people currently out of his favor, and he usually had to be goaded by such people as Poppaea and Tigellinus. Seneca, Faenius, Piso, Rubellius Plautus, and Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix are all examples. And, as Vespasian proved, favor could be regained. The *deteriores* did not have things all their own way, and paragons of virtue did not always stand up to close scrutiny.[9]

3. It is impossible to establish the identity of Seneca's accuser. Syme, *op. cit.*, p. 745, assumes him to have been a freedman of Nero; the text provides no warrant for this. Tentative identification has been made with T. Claudius Romanus, freedman of Claudius; see Furneaux *ad Ann.* 14. 65. 2 and P. Fabia, *Onomasticon Taciteum*, p. 594. Romanus Hispo has been thought of, but his name may have been Romanius; see Syme, *op. cit.*, p. 326, n. 5.

4. *Ann.* 15. 45. The incident provoked rumors of an attempt to have Seneca poisoned. The idea of sending Seneca on such a mission is grimly comic, though it would suit Dio's picture of him! See J. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher in den Annalen des Tacitus* (Heidelberg, 1965), p. 165.

5. The salient references to L. Faenius Rufus are collected by Stein, *PIR*^{2}, III, 116, and by Fabia, *op. cit.*, p. 273. Syme seems not to discuss him.

6. Dio 52. 24 does not mention Piso, but ascribes the plot to Seneca and Rufus.

7. *Ann.* 14. 57. We assume that Tigellinus was behind these charges, though he too had a history of adulteries with Agrippina and Julia for which he had been exiled by Gaius.

8. *Ann.* 15. 50. Both comments are designed to contrast him with Tigellinus.

9. Even Barea Soranus had a skeleton in his cupboard. See Syme, *op. cit.*, p. 544.

PETRONIUS

XXI

TRIMALCHIO'S DOMESTIC STAFF

This paper offers two things: reinforcement of the view[1] that Trimalchio was not an incredibly rich man and not satirised as such by Petronius; and further illumination—insofar as is possible from a comic writer—of an area of Roman social history recently opened up by other scholars.[2]

The very first glimpse of Trimalchio is instructive. He is advertised as *lautissimus homo, horologium in triclinio et bucinatorem habet subornatum, ut subinde sciat quantum de vita perdiderit* (26. 9). This might appear to establish him as a fellow of unusual, perhaps unique, opulence. A clock in one's own home is striking enough; normally a slave was sent to the forum to ascertain the hour and report back.[3] But a civilian trumpeter is impossible to parallel; *bucinatores* in inscriptions (*CIL* 13. 11862) and *Digest* (50. 6. 6) are clearly identified as military men.

Viewed coolly, this luxury is less impressive. For one thing, there is absurd duplication, a point that will recur later. With a clock in the dining room, who needed a trumpeter? Especially in an establishment so plagued with *symphoniaci*.[4] At any rate, we never hear another word of trumpeter (or clock, for that matter) in the *Cena*.

The passage is not evidence for the position of *bucinator* in private houses. Trimalchio's man will have belonged to his master's troupe of *cornicines* who are imported into a later stage of the narrative (78. 5). His unusual role here is quite in keeping with Trimalchio's statement (53. 12) that *cornicines* were one of the two greatest pleasures in life.

It is also possible that the collocation of clock and trumpeter betrays a silly attempt at keeping up with the Roman Joneses. According to Lucian (or pseudo-Lucian), *Hippias* 8, there were clocks that operated δι' ὕδατος καὶ μυκήματος. Trimalchio's trumpeter may have been there to create the sound effects of which his own ordinary clock was incapable.

Trimalchio now comes into view, playing ball *inter pueros capillatos* (27. 1). This type of comely youth recurs throughout the *Cena:* 31. 3: *pueris*

---

1. See, e.g., G. Schmeling, 'Trimalchio's Menu and Wine List,' *CP* 65 (1970), 248–51; Schmeling surveys other relevant studies in his initial footnote.

2. Notably by P. R. C. Weaver in a variety of articles, registered in the bibliography to his own invaluable *Familia Caesaris* (Cambridge, 1972), and by Susan M. Treggiari in three very illuminating papers to which this present contribution owes a great deal: 'Domestic Staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian Period, 27 B.C. to A.D. 68,' *Social History/Histoire Sociale* 6 (1973), 241–55; 'Jobs in the Household of Livia,' *PBSR* 43 (1975), 48–77; 'Jobs for Women,' *AJAH* 1 (1976), 76–104.

3. See Mayor's note on Juvenal 10. 216. Trimalchio was not, however, unique in having a clock (sundial or clepsydra?) at home; cf. Cicero. *Ad fam.* 16. 18. 3; *Digest* 33. 7. 12.

4. See later for these; cf. M. S. Smith's edition of the *Cena* (Oxford, 1975)—hereafter referred to by name only—with regard to 28.5.

Alexandrinis; 34. 4: *duo Aethiopes capillati*; 41. 6: *puer speciosus*; 60.8: *tres pueri candidas succincti tunicas*; 68. 3: *puer Alexandrinus*; 74. 8: *puer non inspeciosus.* Given their initial contrast with *senem*, it may not be too fanciful to suppose that they serve partly to remind Trimalchio of his own youth: *cum adhuc capillatus essem, nam a puero vitam Chiam gessi . . .* (63. 3).

Their presence is no sign of unusual luxury or depravity. Seneca (*Ep.* 95. 24) waxes eloquent on the *puerorum greges* and *agmina exoletorum* in private households. Indeed, Trimalchio is relatively modest. Apart from the first two scenes, in which several boys are required to make up the ball game and attend to a number of guests, the *capillati* enter either individually or only in twos and threes.[5]

Two *spadones* also participate in the ball game (27. 3). Again, it is worth noticing the small number, albeit there may be a further reference at 53.10: *iudicium inter cubicularios*—that is, if *cubicularius* at this period connotes eunuchs.

Possession of eunuchs has been taken to indicate pretension to imperial grandeur.[6] An unnecessary inference. True, both Claudius and Nero were notoriously addicted to individual eunuchs;[7] and before them, personages of the order of Maecenas and Livia had included members of the breed in their retinues.[8] However, Trimalchio displays no particular affection for his *spadones*, which suggests that imperial or quasi-imperial (in the case of Maecenas) passions are not being satirised.

Freedmen of Acte and Poppaea are epigraphically attested as eunuchs (*CIL* 6. 8847, 8954). Admittedly, these are both women of the court of Nero. However, the diatribe of Juvenal against women *quas eunuchi inbelles ac mollia semper/oscula delectent . . .* (6.366–78) is sufficient proof that eunuchs were not restricted to imperial households.[9]

In the bathroom, three *iatraliptae* are found drinking Falernian and quarrelling (28. 3). Another small number. We also notice that they do not give Trimalchio the benefit of their skills. Although berated by the elder Pliny (*NH* 29. 2. 2) in the course of his attack on Greek medicine, his nephew was very concerned to reward an Egyptian freedman called Arpocras, whose iatraliptic skills had helped to save his life (*Ep.* 10. 5). In Pliny's case, the masseur was called in from outside; he had been manumitted by his former owner, the

5. It is quite unnecessary to suppose with R. B. Steele, 'Literary Adaptations and references in Petronius,' *CJ* 15 (1920), 280, that Petronius intends a reference to Nero's Alexandrian claqueurs mentioned by Suetonius, *Nero* 20. 5.

6. By Smith, on 27. 3.

7. Suetonius, *Claudius* 28; *Nero* 28. 2.

8. Seneca, *Ep.* 114. 6 (Maecenas); *CIL* 6. 4238 (Livia—fragmentary).

9. Cf. Juvenal 1. 22 (*cum tener uxorem spado ducat . . .*). Before rushing to condemn Trimalchio and real-life Romans for trafficking in cruelty, etc., we should pause to remember that eunuchs were born as well as made, a distinction reflected in Roman law (*Digest* 23. 3. 39).

foreign lady Thermuthis. It is not clear from Petronius whether or not the bibulous trio actually belongs to Trimalchio.[10]

Trimalchio leaves the bath in a litter, *praecedentibus phaleratis cursoribus quattuor* (28. 4). This modest number stands in contrast with the *grex cursorum* depicted in the mural of Trimalchio's career (29. 7). *Cursores* are abundantly attested in both literature and inscriptions; they tend to be Numidians.[11] Their functions were various, though Juvenal (5. 52) thought it too much to have wine served by a *cursor Gaetulus* at Virro's house. Nero was attended on journeys by a *phalerata Mazacum turba atque cursorum.*[12] By comparison, Trimalchio's entourage is very small-time.

Along with his master goes a *puer vetulus lippus.* This is presumably Trimalchio's *deliciae* Croesus, who appears later (64. 5), described as *puer lippus.* Assuming a further equation with the *cicaro meus* who is to be portrayed on his tombstone (71. 11), Trimalchio does not have much of an erotic retinue. Nor is it a question of his being "kinky" for ugly boys: he is quick to smother a *puer non inspeciosus* with kisses when the latter comes in with a new relay of waiters (74. 8). Rather is it a token of the cheeseparing owner. To be in the fashion, a man needed to display a *deliciae* and a deformed *scurra*:[13] Croesus fulfils both functions. to have him ride on a miserable *chiromaxium* is a further mark of economy.

Trimalchio goes off to the sound of music, provided by a single musician playing in his ear with a miniature set of pipes (28. 6). Music is a constant feature of the *Cena.* But there was nothing odd or ostentatious about this. The well-to-do had had their own musicians since Cicero's day (*Pro Milone* 55). Martial once exasperatedly asks: *quod optimum sit quaeritis convivium?/in quo choraules non erit* (9. 77). Encolpius' comment *pantomimi chorum non patris familiae triclinium crederes* (31. 7) merely exposes his own social ignorance.

At Trimalchio's door there stands an *ostiarius* (28. 8). In earlier days, and perhaps in more old-fashioned houses in Petronius' time, he would have been attached to the door post by a long chain.[14] There is a hint of this in Seneca's definition of the *ianitor* as *mancipium extremum* (*De Ira* 3. 37. 2).

Tacitus, by contrast, bears witness to the arrogance of porters (*Ann.* 4. 74. 6; cf. 6. 8. 10). Hence, when Trimalchio divulges later on (77. 4) that he has furnished his door keeper with a *cellam perbonam*, we may see either an odd generosity to a menial position or the placating of a notoriously arrogant class of slave.

---

10. For an example of a master who has his own masseur, cf. Plutarch, *De San.* 13b.

11. Seneca, *Ep.* 87. 9; 6; *CIL* 8. 12905; *Digest* 32. 99. 5.

12. Suetonius, *Nero* 30. 3.

13. On the subject of *deliciae* and cognates, cf. the admirable article by W. J. Slater in *BICS* 21 (1974), 133–40. References to the presence of deformed creatures in imperial and other households are assembled in (e.g.) Becker's *Gallus* (English version, 210–1). For deformed *scurrae* at court, cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 12. 49. 1 (Paelignus, under Claudius); 15. 34. 3 (Vatinius, under Nero).

14. See Suetonius, *De rhet.* 3: *L. Voltacilius Plotus servisse dicitur atque etiam ostiarius vetere more in catena fuisse*; cf. Ovid, *Amor.* 1. 161; *ianitor, indignum, dura religate catena.*

One of the original jobs of the porter was to keep an eye on outgoing slaves, a function here advertised by the notice *Quisquis servus sine dominico iussu foras exierit, accipiet plagas centum* (28. 7). It was also his responsibility to keep out unwanted callers, to which end he normally had a stick and a dog to employ when needed.[15]

Trimalchio's man has neither. Although there are both pets and hunting dogs within the house (64. 6; 40. 2), he must make do with a *canis pictus*. Although paralleled by mosaics from Pompeii,[16] this could be a tribute to Trimalchio's parsimony, or his easy-going attitude to callers.

And instead of having his *arundo* at the ready, the porter is casually shelling peas into a silver dish. Unless they are for his own use, this is no job for an *ostiarius*. It is the mark of a mean owner to have slaves doubling in more than one role. We have already noticed how Juvenal's tight-fisted Virro employed Gaetulian *cursores* as wine waiters. When Cicero excoriates Piso for his wretched household, he picks out this aspect: *idem coquus, idem atriensis (In Pis.* 67). This will not be the only occasion on which Trimalchio appears guilty of the same thing.

There has been some discussion as to why the *ostiarius* should be wearing green clothes with a cherry-red belt. It could of course be simply a jokey way of emphasising the colourful atmosphere of Trimalchio's establishment, without deeper meaning. Alternatively, it was worn to distinguish the *ostiarius* from a less prestigious attendant. The notion that it identifies the door keeper as a partisan of the Greens seems ruled out by Trimalchio's own hostility to that faction. Unless very tolerant, an owner who calls another slave *prasinianus famosus* (70. 10) is hardy likely to have allowed the hated colour to have been advertised at his own front door.

An *atriensis* is also on hand (29. 9) to explain Trimalchio's murals to Encolpius. The title is commonly mistranslated as "porter". In the middle Republic, an *atriensis* had been responsible for the *atrium* and the gold kept there. By Cicero's day, slaves under this title were simply *qui tergunt, qui ungunt, qui verrunt, qui spargunt.* The younger Pliny classifies them collectively along with *topiarii* and *fabri* as necessary expenses.[17] This decline in status makes the later joke (53. 10) of having another *atriensis* exiled to Baiae all the funnier.

As Treggiari observes, the *atriensis* had lost ground to the *dispensator.*[18] In Trimalchio's pictorial biography, the artist has shown how the hero *ratiocinari didicisset, denique dispensator factus esset.* Trimalchio may have been promoted

15. For the stick (*virga* or *arundo*), Propertius 4. 7. 21; Seneca, *De const. sap.* 14. 1; Petronius, *Sat.* 98. 1. For guard dogs, Suetonius, *Vit.* 16.

16. See Smith's note; it is just possible that Petronius has the artificial guard dogs of Hephaestus in Homer, *Od.* 7. 91f., in mind.

17. Cf. Plautus, *Pseud.* 608–10; Cicero, *De parad.* 5. 37; Pliny, *Ep.* 3. 19. 3.

18. Thus, only one of Livia's staff so identifies himself (*CIL* 6, 3942), albeit we hear of several in the household of the Statilii (*CIL* 6. 6239–42, 6215). Could it be that the position was particularly diminished at the imperial level?

from a lower financial grade such as *arcarius*. The eminence and functions of a *dispensator* are too familiar to detail here.[19] In Trimalchio's own household, this functionary is encountered *aureos numerantem* (30. 9). On balance, a reasonable activity for such an official, albeit perhaps a trifle obvious, viewed symbolically. However, Juvenal's gambler takes his *dispensator* along with the *arca* to the game (*Sat.* 1. 90–2). It is worth noting that Trimalchio's steward, probably a slave,[20] is *superbus*, owns slaves of his own, and also *vestimenta cubitoria*.

A little earlier (30. 1), the guests had seen a *procurator* at the entrance to the dining room. Commentators[21] have wondered whether or not this term is employed synonymously with *dispensator* here. Probably not. The *procurator* is a well-attested grade for both imperial and private establishments.[22] This latter point is important. Trimalchio must not be presumed to be aping the imperial household. That, in real life, could get a man into fatal trouble, as Torquatus Silanus was to find out in 64![23] The term *procurator*, however, in a private domestic context, is as old as Plautus.[24]

Contrary to some editors,[25] this official was superior to the *dispensator*. Recognition of that may help both enhancement of Petronius' subtle humour and resolution of a small textual point. Given his status, it is bizarre that a *procurator* should be receiving accounts at the entrance to the dining room. Especially as the *dispensator* appears to have his own little office or annex.[26] Trimalchio has got the grades confused; he would be a mortal offender of civil servants!

Appreciation of the niceties of Roman domestic organisation may assist with another textual item. As they attempt to enter the dining room, the guests are held back by a call of *dextro pede*! from a *puer qui supra hoc officium erat positus* (30. 5). This phrase was deleted by Fraenkel on the grounds that it recurs (with the change of *supra* to *super*) at 56. 8, in the context of a recital of the apophoreta.

The phrase should in fact be retained.[27] More than one jest is involved. The point of *dextro pede* is to have Trimalchio's dining room treated as a temple;

---

19. See the first two of Treggiari's articles, cited in the first note.

20. None of Livia's attested stewards indicate free status: *CIL* 6. 3965b, 3968, 4237; cf. J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome* (London, 1967), 187.

21. See Smith's notes to 30. 1, 9.

22. For *liberti et procuratores* in private houses, *CIL* 6. 9830–8.

23. Tacitus, *Ann.* 15. 35: Torquatus had been dubbing his top freedmen *ab epistulis, a rationibus*, etc.

24. *Pseud.* 608; cf. Becker's *Gallus*, 204–5, for an accumulation of references.

25. E.g., Smith on 30. 9.

26. That is, accepting Heraeus' *in oecario* for the *in precario* of H, as does, for example, Smith, or else following Müller's *in procoetone* (cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 2. 17. 10, for this noun). Bücheler and others read *in atrio*, but it is perhaps hard to see why this should have been corrupted into *in precario* (unless this latter can mean "a place for requests to be heard"). Anyway, a steward in the atrium would be about as bizarre as his superior at the entrance to the dining room.

27. The phrase was restored by Müller to his second edition, and is defended by J. P. Sullivan, 'Interpolations in Petronius,' *PCPS* N. S. 22 (1976), 101.

Vitruvius (3. 4. 4) prescribes the right foot as the one that must touch the first and last step of a temple first. The boy, then, functions as an acolyte in the present secular context.

Secondly, it may be observed that, by the standards of the palace and of genuinely important households, Trimalchio's house is remarkaby easy to get into. The previous discussion of *ostiarius*, dog, and stick is pertinent here. There is no sign of any usher (*rogator*) or the *ab admissione* who screened guests. The boy in question represents, in addition to the temple motif, a silly attempt by his master to conceal his lack of regular expert staff.

During the tumult that attends the clearing away of the *gustatoria*, a dish is dropped (34. 3), whereupon *insecutus est lecticarius argentumque inter reliqua purgamenta scopis coepit everrere.* Modern editors such as Müller and Smith are tempted by Dousa's emendation *supellecticarius*, on the grounds that a litter-bearer would not be doubling as a sweeper in Trimalchio's establishment, and that Encolpius could not have recognised a *lecticarius* as such.

The latter point could easily be countered by supposing Petronius' dramatic realism to have slipped, or on the assumption that litter-bearers, as in the earlier case of the *phalerati cursores*, were recognisable by their uniform. However, there is more to it than this. The passage is a perfect illustration of the need to synthesise literary taste with awareness of historical background. At first blush, Dousa's proposal *is* attractive.[28] It is consonant with the principle of *lectio difficilior eoque potior: supellecticarius* is elsewhere found only in the *Digest* (33. 7. 12). Trimalchio's man might also be thought analogous to the *a supellectile* attested for Livia's establishment.[29]

In spite of all this, however, Trimalchio would still be made to look ignorant or parsimonious in his staff arrangements. For a *supellecticarius* should no more have been sweeping up than a litter-bearer. In good households, there were *scoparii* to do this.[30]

Four dancers prelude the famous episode of *Carpe, carpe* (36. 1). The small number should again be noted. It is not clear whether they belong to the house or are part of an imported troupe of entertainers. They are not called upon to do anything more skilled than run up to the table *ad symphoniam* and lift off the lid of a dish. Then Carpus the *scissor* goes through his routine. A little later (40. 4), another carver is brought in to hack away at a boar.

There was nothing unusual in having one or more carvers; Livia and the Statilii exhibit as many as Trimalchio in their households.[31] Seneca (*Ep.* 47. 6) fulminates against the profession of *structor: infelix qui huic uni rei vivit, ut altilia decenter secet.* Nor are Trimalchio's carvers as dextrous as those attested elsewhere. At Virro's table, according to Juvenal (5. 120–1), you could see

28. I ignore the other desperate emendations registered in Bücheler's *apparatus*.
29. See Treggiari's article on the household of Livia, 55 (with n. 98).
30. Attested in the *Digest* 33. 7. 8.
31. *CIL* 6. 8911, 6353–4 (bearing in mind Treggiari's warning that *structor* can be ambiguous in that it may mean carver or construction worker).

structorem saltantem; Carpus, by contrast, has four assistants to provide the dance steps! Both he and the other man do nothing more than rip and hack (*laceravit* and *percussit* are the operative verbs), whereas Seneca's expert *per pectus et clunes certis ductibus circumferens eruditam manum frusta excutit.*

Trimalchio has been accused[32] of boastfulness for his mention of more than one *medicus* in attendance (47. 1). This is misleading. After all, he has had constipation for some time, and might reasonable be expected to seek a second opinion as to a cure. Nor does he refer to the doctors with a possessive—it is simply *nec medici se inveniunt.* True, doctors are on hand at 54. 2, where they rush in on cue to treat the master's bruised arm, but this not very exacting bit of first aid could have been performed by any masseur or house slave retained for minor ailments. There is no suggestion in the *Cena* that Trimalchio emulates the imperial grandeur of a Livia, whose medical staff was large and seemingly untypical.[33]

When three white pigs are ushered into the dining room (47. 8), their ages are announced by the *nomenculator.* This familiar official is best known, of course, for tipping off his master as to the names of people encountered in the street or at a *salutatio.*[34] In the triclinium, he had the duty of showing guests to their places.[35] Announcing an item on the menu is a duty of the *nomenculator* attested by the elder Pliny.[36] On this showing, there is nothing unique about Trimalchio's employment of this functionary. The joke may also be that the pigs, by being introduced with their ages, are treated with the sort of respect that was due to human guests.[37]

The unsurprising fact that Trimalchio has more than one cook (47. 10) requires no commentary. Of greater interest is the revelation (47. 11) that his staff are organised into *decuriae.* This has been taken as something of a joke, in that other evidence for *decuriae* and decurions in urban households is restricted to the staff of the emperor. Yet this generalisation may be refuted by a little-noticed inscription from Pompeii: *quaeres Fabium et Fallacem in decuria Cotini.*[38]

A passage from Columella is instructive: *Classes enim non maiores quam denum hominum faciundae, quas decurias appellaverunt antiqui . . .* (1. 9. 7). The context is agricultural. The joke, then, does not rest upon boasting as to sheer numbers of slaves, which would in any case be paralleled for a *privatus* by a

32. Cf. Smith's sensible note.

33. Albeit there is epigraphic evidence for family hospitals of sorts in some non-imperial homes (*CIL* 6. 4475), and Seneca, *De const. sap.* 13. 3, attests to the presence of medical orderlies in private households.

34. For *nomenclatores* in private households during the Julio-Claudian period, cf. *CIL* 6. 4455, 6071, 8602, 9700.

35. Athenaeus 47e.

36. *NH* 32. 6. 63—a passage not noticed by Smith.

37. Martial 10. 30. 23 depicts a *nomenculator* summoning fish by their names!

38. *CIL* 4. 1604 (the Index to that volume offers no other example of *decuria*), a reference that escaped even the vigilant Treggiari's assembly of references in her Livia paper, n. 131.

passage in Seneca,[39] but in Trimalchio's misapplication of agricultural organisation to his urban *familia*.[40] There may be some enhancement of the point later (74. 7), when Encolpius refers to a new relay of waiters as a *classis*.

When an errant cook is stripped for punishment, he is described as standing dolefully *inter duos tortores* (49. 6). This has been interpreted as one of Trimalchio's most glaring pretensions to imperial splendour, since slaves in charge of the disciplining of fellow-slaves are not attested for private households. It is true that Juvenal's line *sunt quae tortoribus annua praestent* (6. 480) probably refers to the hiring of public slaves. But who was going to punish the steward's slave (also stripped for a flogging) earlier in the *Cena* (30. 7)?

In point of fact, it is unlikely that the two slaves flanking the delinquent cook were actually skilled torturers in the employ of Trimalchio. For the atmosphere of his house is pure Queen of Hearts. The cook is begged off, as are the slave who breaks a cup (52. 6), the *puer* who falls against Trimalchio's arm (53. 1), and the aforementioned slave of the steward. The worst punishment we see is a box on the ears for another cup-dropping youth[41] (34. 2).

One of Trimalchio's notorious onomastic puns involves a maker of Corinthian plate called Corinthus (50. 4). Non-addicts of paronomasia (addicts too, for that matter) should not overlook an interesting reflection here of Trimalchio's relative economic and social modesty. He identifies Corinthus as *aerarius a quo emo*. In other words, Trimalchio does not have his own silversmith. This puts him in harmony with the Julio-Claudian period: few if any silversmiths are attested for non-imperial owners.[42]

Three related points are germane. Trimalchio's liking for Corinthian ware merely conforms to the fashion of the early imperial period.[43] The confining of his taste to silver is in keeping with the Tiberian prohibition on the ownership of gold plate by private citizens.[44] Finally, the play on Corinthus' name may also be a comment on the naming of goblets and the like after makers' names: we hear of Thericlean earthware cups and Mentor-made dippers from Athenaeus (470f.) and Lucian (*Lex.* 7).

The scene in which an *actuarius* recites some accounts *tanquam urbis acta*

---

39. *De tranq.* 8. 6: *numerus illi cotidie servorum velut imperatori exercitus referebatur.*

40. Although there would be nothing silly about Trimalchio having a *decuria viatorum* (47. 13), given that he is a businessman active throughout southern Italy (48. 2).

41. All of this is a far cry from the brutal Vedius Pollio, who had to be restrained by Augustus from throwing a slave to his *muraenae* for breaking a goblet (Seneca, *De ira* 3. 40. 2–3), which is not to overlook the crucifixion of a slave for taking Trimalchio's name in vain (53. 3). However (the text does not make it clear), this probably happened on one of his other estates (the matter comes up during the reading of the accounts at table), and may arguably have been ordered by someone other than Trimalchio. Even if this is not the case, the evidence of the *Cena* is that the host was not habitually cruel.

42. For the epigraphic evidence, cf. Treggiari's Livia article, n. 95. One or two inscriptions are ambiguous as to the smith's status.

43. See B. Baldwin, 'Trimalchio's Corinthian Plate,' *CP* 68 (1973), 46–8.

44. Tacitus, *Ann.* 2. 33.

(53. 1) would appear to be the most blatant case of imperial pretensions. It has been argued that Trimalchio's property is organised as a miniature Rome.[45] There may be something in this. The sequence certainly contains what seems to be the most egregious boast of the entire *Cena*, namely the birth of thirty boys and forty girls at the Cumaean estate on a single day.[46]

That is, assuming this was the time span intended by Petronius. There is something to be said for Friedländer's view that the record covers a reporting period of some months, an argument strengthened[47] by the fact that the first three items (also the most seemingly outrageous) have no temporal indication, whereas the subsequent and more plausible events are specified as occurring *eodem die.*

It should also be kept in mind that Trimalchio's greatest extravagances (if so interpreted) all occur in this report. According to the *Digest*,[48] "Men often think their assets are greater than they really are. This frequently happens to people who have overseas businesses in remote parts of the world, managed by slaves and freedmen; often the business declines over a long period without their knowing it." It is possible that we are expected to see an aping of this scale of enterprise on the part of Trimalchio, whose interests are concentrated in Southern Italy. Having the accounts read at table may be nothing more than another attempt at playing the big business man[49] working overtime.

Staff mentioned in the accounts include *saltuarii, vilices,* a *circ(um)itor,* a *liberta* and a bathman caught in adultery, a steward defending an unspecified court action, and litigation between *cubicularii.* This last is a realistic touch, if one may believe Seneca (*Dial.* 2. 14. 1) on their arrogance. There is also the famous case of the *atriensis* exiled to Baiae. Such a congenial-looking punishment seems a good joke. It is possible that there is more in it. Tacitus (*Ann.* 13. 26) refers to the constant exiling of freedmen to Campania. At another level Suetonius (*Nero* 30. 5) states that Nero had convicts shipped to the Bay of Naples area to work on his building projects at Baiae and Misenum.[50] Conceivably a contemporary allusion therefore.

Along with trumpeters, acrobats are Trimalchio's favourite pleasure in life, on his own admission. It is therefore very likely that the *petauristarii* who come in to entertain the guests (53. 11) are his own. Indeed, if the *puer* who falls on Trimalchio is the boy acrobat of the previous section (the text is a little uncertain), the issue is beyond doubt, since the latter is set free by Trimalchio and so must have been his slave.

---

45. By K. F. C. Rose, 'Trimalchio's Accountant,' *CP* 62 (1967), 258–9.

46. See the notes of Friedländer and Smith for the incredible implications as to the population and food-producing capacities of the Cumaean estate.

47. Rather than weakened, as Smith maintains.

48. *Digest* 40. 9. 10, as translated by Crook, *op. cit.*, 188.

49. I agree with Smith that Suetonius, *Galba* 12. 3 (*adposita lautiore cena ingemuisse eum, et ordinario quidem dispensatori breviarium rationum offerenti . . .*) is ambiguous. but Trimalchio is no Galba, and there is no need to hunt out parallels or inspirations for every Petronian joke.

50. Cf. J. H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (Harvard, 1970), 155.

To have one's own troupe seems to have been regarded as vulgar and pretentious. Hence, no doubt, the striking absence of entertainers from the entourage of Livia.[51] In the late Republic, Cicero had attacked the freedman Chrysogonus for maintaining his own entertainers; nearer to Trimalchio's day, Ummidia Quadratilla's ownership of *pantomimi* shocked the younger Pliny.[52] Trimalchio's indulgence, then, is by no means unique.

Likewise, the *Homeristae* who troop in later (59. 2) offer a very common type of entertainment. The joke here is mainly in Trimalchio's response: while they talked in Greek verse, he *canora voce Latine legebat librum.* This may indicate that he has to follow Homer with the aid of a Latin crib, as Smith maintains, though one would have expected the Easterner Trimalchio's Greek to have been better than his Latin. Furthermore, what sort of Latin versions of Homer could possibly have been circulating in his time?[53]

A better explanation is that the ill-bred Trimalchio, whose lack of culture is exposed in what follows (his idiosyncratic account of the Trojan War), cannot sit still and listen to a respectable gentleman's entertainment without soon interrupting with some irrelevancies. Encolpius' comment on the Greek converse (*ut insolenter solent*) suggests that he himself is not very different.[54]

So much for Trimalchio's staff. A word on their nomenclature will be instructive. In the course of the *Cena*, we see or hear mention of: Cario, Carpus, Cinnamus, Croesus, Daedalus, Dionysus, Menophila, Mithridates, Nasta, Philargyrus, Stichus. An Hellenic-looking bunch, for the most part. Given their master's origins, and the apparent Southern Italian setting, that occasions no surprise.[55]

One must guard against the temptation to exploit homonyms as a means of dating the *Satyricon.* Grimal,[56] for instance, was confident that Carpus was meant to remind the readers of Nero's *libertus* of that name (*CIL* 6. 143). But the name is commonly attested in inscriptions. On the same reckoning, we should relate Philargyrus to Livia, since she had a medical orderly of the same name![57] In somewhat the same vein, the *agnomen* Maecenatianus claimed by Trimalchio (71. 12) need not inevitably connote the minister of Augustus. There was a Maecenatianus on the staff of Livia, and there will have been others in real life—not all can have been rich and effeminate patrons of the arts in emulation of *the* Maecenas.

---

51. A point made by Treggiari in her Livia paper, 56.

52. Cicero, *Pro Rosc. Amer.* 134; Pliny, *Ep.* 7. 24.

53. Trimalchio is surely not part of the archaist movement, conning the works of Livius Andronicus, Ennius, and so on!

54. Encolpius' subsequent criticism of the poor quality of Habinnas' slave's rendition of Virgil (68. 5) required no great expertise or judgement. It did not take much to realise that Atellane verses are not a normal feature of the *Aeneid*, and the shaky volume of the reader's voice reflected a fault normally corrected at elementary school (Quintilian 1. 8. 1).

55. How far a Greek name indicates Greek blood is, of course, a tricky question; cf. J. Griffin's important article, 'Augustan Poetry and the Life of Luxury,' *JRS* 66 (1976), 95, n. 147.

56. 'Note à Pétrone,' *RPh* 15 (1941), 19.

57. Livia also had a *calciator* by the name of Menophilus (*CIL* 6. 3939).

It may briefly be subjoined that the names of Trimalchio's slaves are common enough. Even the more outlandish-looking ones are at least paralleled: a Mithridates, for instance, is epigraphically attested—he was a *pistor!*[58]

We have seen the sort of staff Trimalchio had. It is worth considering what he does not have (making due allowance for the occasional lacunae in the text of the *Cena*). The apparent absence of any children reduces the number of menials needed by him and his wife. The latter, Fortunata, seems oddly short of help. She bustles around the dining room during the meal (37. 1), counts the silver (67. 1), and even helps a cook by grinding pepper (74. 5). To some extent, she may be intended as a parody of the good *domina* represented by Livia—responsible for the wool and so on. But she may also reflect the tight-fisted approach of her husband towards domestic staff. We have already noted how short Trimalchio is in many areas of service. It can be added that there is a striking absence of women—no female slaves and no female entertainers are in view. Which may be one reason why Fortunata attempts to dance! Similarly, Habinnas' inept slave is the nearest we get to a *lector*. Finally, in view of the obvious humour Petronius could have extracted from it, one ought to emphasise the absence of a *praegustator*.

This paper presumes the correctness of the orthodox dating of the *Satyricon* to Nero's reign. It also takes for granted that there are detectable allusions to contemporary people and fashions. Great restraint must nevertheless be exercised in the hunt for specific references to Nero and the imperial lifestyle.[59] There is little or nothing in Trimalchio's household that is particularly unusual or extravagant. Rather is the reverse more often true. Trimalchio is a vulgarian who, socially and culturally, gets things wrong. With regard to staff, he is economical, constantly cutting corners by having slaves double up on their functions and the like. In this, he is to some degree a literary type: from Cicero's Piso to Juvenal's Virro, his sort of domestic economy is an object of derision.[60]

Finally, it may be observed that the picture of Trimalchio thus achieved is reasonably consonant with the statement of Plutarch (*Moralia* 60e) that flatterers reproach profligate and extravagant spenders with meanness and sordidness, as Titus Petronius did with Nero.

---

58. *ILS* 742a. Of all the names, that of Dionysus is the most suspect, but it is clearly in for the pun on Liber, and need be no more than a crude play on the common Dionysius.

59. See the long register assembled by a sensibly cautious Rose in his *Date and Author of the Satyricon*, 82–6.

60. Cp. Seneca's condemnation of the elaborate households of the rich, *Ep.* 47. 6–8.

XXII

IRA PRIAPI

Petronian scholars cleave with extraordinary devotion to the idea that the wrath of Priapus was one of the basic plot motifs of the *Satyricon*; perhaps *the* motif.[1] Now the very notion that there was a precise structure and recurrent theme in the *Satyricon* is more a matter of faith than of evidence.[2] But even if the notion be assumed, the claims of *ira Priapi* are really very weak.

The passage most often cited in support of the theory is the short poem declaimed by (presumably)[3] Encolpius at *Sat.* 139:

> Non solum me numen et implacabile fatum
> persequitur. prius Inachia Tirynthius ora
> exagitatus onus caeli tulit, ante profanam
> Laomedon gemini satiavit numinis iram;
> Iunonem Pelias sensit, tulit inscius arma
> Telephus et regnum Neptuni pavit Ulixes.
> me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor
> Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi.

But the last two lines prove nothing. The bulk of the poem forms a register of divine angers against humans as epic themes; the speaker is doing no more than canonize himself as a Homeric hero. The mock literary flavor is given added spice by the fact that the last line is designed to recall a line of Virgil (*Georg.* 4. 111: "Hellespontiaci servet tutela Priapi"). Nor is it easy to think of weaker evidence from which to reconstruct the basic plot than the various poetic outbursts which stud the *Satyricon.* What fun one could have applying this criterion to some of the flourishes of, say,

1. For recent manifestations, see, e.g., J.P. Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius* (London, 1968), pp. 92-93 and *passim*; P.G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 76 f.; A.M. Cameron, "Myth and Meaning in Petronius: Some Modern Comparisons", *Latomus*, XXIX (1970), 397 f.

2. This essentially goes back to E. Klebs, "Zur Komposition von Petronius' Satirae," *Philologus*, XLVII (1889), 623 f.

3. One must remember the extreme textual mutilations in the final sequences. I imagine it is Encolpius who declaims, but can we be sure?

Eumolpus or Trimalchio! And, finally, the wrath of Priapus is the most obvious conceit for use by a randy picaresque hero temporarily frustrated by unwonted impotence.

This last point is cardinal. Impotence, usually occasioned by magic, was a common literary theme. Ovid devoted a poem to it (*Amores* 3. 7), and it is a feature of amatory poetry.[4] Elsewhere in the *Satyricon*, Encolpius was assaulted *diu multumque frustra* by a *cinaedus* (significantly, or by chance, this episode[5] also occurs in a sequence marked by textual corruption and the hovering presence of Priapus), and Eumolpus was almost reduced to impotence by the demands of his catamite in Asia.[6] It is as fair to say that Petronius is parodying (or simply using) a stock theme of erotic verse as to believe that he was sustaining a parody of the wrath of Poseidon.

True, Encolpius killed a sacred goose of Priapus (*Sat.* 137), and he had earlier seen something he should not have in the shrine of Priapus (*Sat.* 17). So Quartilla claimed, and Encolpius does not deny it. But he does reassure Quartilla that he will not betray the secret. Admittedly, he was not the sort to prize an oath too religiously, but *prima facie* he exhibits more respect (if only for reasons of self-preservation) than scorn for Priapus. And the sacred goose is not the *anser* to the question. Unless there is a great deal missing from the text, the killing of the goose is too close to the lament of *Sat.* 139 to give literal truth to the image of *ira Priapi* pursuing Encolpius over the seas.

Stress is often laid on the episode in which Encolpius' presence on Lichas' ship is betrayed by a dream in which Priapus appears to denounce Encolpius' whereabouts (*Sat.* 104). It is less commonly pointed out that Tryphaena immediately caps this by reporting her dream in which the presence aboard of Giton was revealed by a picture of Neptune. This balancing of dreams obviates any assumption that Priapus betrayed Encolpius out of his recurrent *ira*. Petronius is merely playing with the stock theme of revelatory dreams in epic literature (one thinks of the rash of these in *Aeneid* 2).

Finally, the fragment preserved by Sidonius Apollinaris, in which the Arbiter is connected with the gardens of Massilia and called *Hellespontiaco*

4. One need only think of Catullus 67. 26-27, or Virro in Juvenal 9. The theme is frequent in the poems of the *Anth. Pal.*: see, e.g., 5.47, 11.29, 11.30, 12.11, 12.216, 12.232, 12.240. See G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy*[2] (London, 1969), pp. 92 f.; and K.F. Smith *ad* Tib. 1.5.41.

5. *Sat.* 23.

6. *Sat.* 86.

parem Priapo,[7] is too isolated to prove anything. Certainly, it does not suggest any offense to the god. There is, in fact, no less likely candidate for the wrath of Priapus than Encolpius. His sight of what went on *in sacello Priapi* and the killing of the goose were both unintentional slights. And Priapus will not have been angry, as some used to claim, at Encolpius' taste for pederasty, for the god himself was traditionally a *puerorum amator.*[8]

One has to be honestly negative and admit that no one can prove anything about the presumed plot of the *Satyricon.* But if anything has been more exaggerated by critics than the sexual element in the work, it is the supposed theme of parody of epic. For a picaresque novel to work at all, the hero has to get into all sorts of scrapes which compel flight and travel. Otherwise, there can be no action. Undeniably, Petronius derived much literary fun from comic perversions of literary themes. But they are much more important as details than as basic plot. It is still valid to believe that the *Satyricon* may have been a series of self-contained adventures, characters recurred, not a running motif.

7. *Frag.* 4.
8. See K.F. Smith *ad* Tib. 1.4.3 for the references.

XXIII

PETRONIUS AND THE FIRE OF ROME

Expiscation of Neronian allusions from the *Satyricon* is a never-ending business; witness the ninety or so items collected by Rose (1). Here is yet one more possible one. When it occurred to me, I was sure of one thing only: namely, that the idea could not possibly be unique to myself. And sure enough, although apparently not in Rose's splendid book, nor in the standard commentaries consulted today, I found the notion adumbrated in a footnote in the recent book on the Roman novel by Walsh (2).

During the *cena* of Trimalchio, the guests are regaled by readings from the host's accounts, which are drawn up in a style *tanquam urbis acta* (3). One item is this: *incendium factum est in hortis Pompeianis, ortum ex aedibus Nastae vilici.*

Fires, of course, were hardly infrequent in Rome, and were not restricted to the reigns of "bad" emperors. Aulus Gellius, for instance, reports one from the Antonine period. It is equally obvious that the fire in Trimalchio's garden could simply be a dramatic prop, with no intended reference to any actual conflagration.

However, collation of the Petronian passage with Tacitus' description of the fire of 64 reveals some interesting details (4); taken together, they may add up. Walsh picks out only one: the second outbreak in 64, which began *praediis Tigellini Aemilianis.* It is certainly possible to regard the praetorian prefect Tigellinus as the emperor's bailiff. And such a description would be congenial to Nero's *arbiter*, who owes his eventual doom to the *invidia Tigellini* (5). An added sneer is provided by the use of the name Nasta, which is servile or libertine (6), and which has the right connotations for Ofonius Tigellinus, whose origins were distinctly humble (7).

Next, the *horti Pompeiani.* It is, of course, impossible to be sure if the phrase means "gardens at Pompeii" or "the gardens of Pompeius". For present purposes, the former is the desired meaning. For when the fire of 64 broke out, Nero was in his birthplace of Antium. Thus, Petronius could be making a subtle allusion to the rumours concerning Nero and incendiary plots. The fire broke out in the Bay of Naples area, where the *princeps* was.

The *horti* continue to be pertinent. According to Tacitus, Nero did not set out from Antium for Rome until *domui eius, qua Palatium et Maecenatis hortos continuaverat, ignis propinquaret.* As a relief measure for the populace, the emperor throws open *hortos suos.* Now, recollect that the full appellation of Trimalchio is C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus, and a correlation between the *horti Pompeiani* (in the second of its two possible meanings) and

---

(1) K. F. C. Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon*, Leiden 1971, pp. 82-6.
(2) P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge 1970, p. 130, n. 6.
(3) *Sat.* 53, 2.
(4) Tacitus, *Ann.* 15, 38 ff.
(5) *Ann.* 16, 18.
(6) For examples, see Martial 9, 87, 5; *ILS* 8329.
(7) See Mayor's typically gargantuan note on Juvenal 1, 155 for full details and references.

Tacitus' reference to *Maecenatis hortos* in the incendiary context is at least possible.

Last, and most compelling, the dates of the two fires. Tacitus states that the fire of 64 began XIIII *Kal. Sextilis*; Trimalchio's gardens burned on VII *Kalendas Sextiles*. Not identical, but close enough to be striking. And the coincidence may be reinforced by the archaic *Sextilis* used by both authors. Rose points out that Petronius does not call July *Quintilis* (8), but does not notice the Tacitean item in question (9). This usage of Tacitus, indeed, rather spoils Rose's contention that Petronius uses *Sextilis* to illustrate the archaic style of accountants (10), and his conclusion that the usage would be unlikely after the first century A.D.

For the above reasons, then, it is possible that we can see an allusion to the fire of 64 in Trimalchio's accounts. If accepted, the point is another widow's mite towards a Neronian dating for the *Satyricon* (11). It remains just as possible, I concede, that the details adduced are all coincidental; of the similarities registered, I think the dates of the two fires (along with the usage *Sextilis*) are the most striking. However, the impatient reader can always start a third fire, and consign this note to its flames: *habent sua fata libelli*.

---

(8) *Sat.* 38, 10: *ex Kalendis Juliis*.
(9) *Op. cit.*, pp. 27-8.
(10) Adducing Cicero, *Orator* 158, for this.
(11) It would make this part of the *Satyricon* relatively late in the reign of Nero and the life of Petronius, and would upset the confident dating of the work to 60 or earlier by G. Bagnani, *Arbiter of Elegance*, Toronto 1954, pp. 3-26.

XXIV

OPIMIAN WINE

At an early stage in his Banquet, that far from perfect host Trimalchio had his guests served with a wine described as *Falernum Opimianum annorum centum*; such was the legend on the labels which were affixed to the glass amphorae from which the vintage was served.[1] Trimalchio capped his "generosity" by the celebrated and tactless remark to the effect that he was serving his guests with genuine Opimian (*verum Opimianum praesto*), whereas he had provided inferior vintages on the previous evening for superior guests!

The episode has been taken as merely illustrating the boorish ignorance of the host.[2] The insult to his guests is palpable. Assuming the dramatic date of the *Satyricon* to fall within the reign of Nero, his Opimian wine would be at least 170 years old. If genuine, such a vintage would not impress the oenosoph as being very potable. Perhaps Petronius intends the joke to be against the ignorant pretensions of self-styled connoisseurs. This would be on a par with Trimalchio's farcical claim to have a monopoly on Corinthian plate[3]; many other examples could be adduced, without difficulty or profit, from the *Cena*.

However, Opimian wine is an unusually curious vintage, and a study of other literary references is relevant to the Petronius passage, though our confusion is increased rather than cleared.

The most striking allusion is contained in Velleius Paterculus.

[1] *Satyricon*, 34: *Statim allatae sunt amphorae vitreae diligenter gypsatae, quarum in cervicibus pittacia erant affixa cum hoc titulo: "Falernum Opimianum annorum centum." Dum titulos perlegimus, complosit Trimalchio manus et "Eheu" inquit "ergo diutius vivit vinum quam homuncio. Quare tengomenas faciamus. Vita vinum est. Verum Opimianum praesto. Heri non tam bonum posui, et multo honestiores cenabant."*

[2] E. g., Becker, in the 1888 English edition of his *Gallus* (p. 492), comments: "A double absurdity: first in assigning a fixed age to wine, which every year became older, and then in calling the *Opimianum* a century old . . . we may easily conceive that at a still later period it was supposed to be drunk, long after it had, in fact, ceased to exist." Friedlaender, in his Commentary on Petronius (Leipzig, 1906), *ad loc.*, describes the allusion as: "ein Beweis der Prahlsucht Trimalchios und zugleich seiner Unwissenheit."

[3] *Satyricon*, 50.

Immediately after his account of the death of Gaius Gracchus and the punishment of his adherents, Velleius, though not without apology, inserts a reference to Opimian wine.[4] He asserts that the Opimian wine of 121 can be inferred to be no longer obtainable in the year 30 A.D. (the consulship of Marcus Vinicius) because of the interval of 150 years. Though Velleius is no great stylist, this passage is most obtrusive in the general context, and seems to contain a slightly polemical tinge.

Velleius' observation is hardly staggering. We know little of classical wines, but will not be too surprised by the disappearance of a wine of 150 years vintage. Moreover, his statement seems to be confirmed by no less a person than Cicero. In a passage in his *Brutus*, usually dated to 46 B.C., he refers to Opimian wine, and to wine bottled in the consulship of Anicius (160 B.C.), as being the supreme vintages, but now well past their prime; indeed, in Cicero's day, they are scarcely potable.[5]

Velleius, reinforced by Cicero, seems to have destroyed the pretensions of Trimalchio. But when we turn to the erudite pages of the elder Pliny, our new confidence is shaken. In his account of wines of exceptional age and value,[6] he includes Opimian as an extant vintage. The wine is reduced to the consistency of bitter honey, and cannot be drunk neat or with water. Its use is now less glorious: it can serve as a seasoning for improving other wines. Its monetary value is unimpaired. The original value is reckoned at 100 sesterces per amphora, but in the reign of Gaius the wine costs 100 sesterces for one-

[4] Velleius, II, 7, 5: *Rei tantae parum ad notitiam pertinens interponetur. Hic est Opimius, a quo consule celeberrimum Opimiani vini nomen; quod iam nullum esse spatio annorum colligi potest, cum ab eo sint ad te, M. Vinici, consulem anni centum et quinquaginta.*

[5] Cicero, *Brutus*, 83, 287: *Ut si quis Falerno delectetur sed eo nec ita novo ut proximis consulibus natum velit, nec rursus ita vetere ut Opimium aut Anicium consulem quaerat—"atqui hae notae sunt optimae," credo; sed nimia vetustas nec habet eam quam quaerimus suavitatem nec est iam sane tolerabilis.*

[6] Pliny, *N.H.*, XIV, 6, 55: The passage is too long to quote in full, but the comment on the longevity of Opimian and other vintages runs thus: *durantque adhuc vina ea cc fere annis, iam in speciem redacta mellis asperi . . . nec potari per se queant pervincive aqua.* See J. André (Budé ed., Paris, 1958) *ad loc.*; he does not, however, notice our Velleius passage.

twelfth of an amphora. Indeed, Pliny states that he mentioned this point in his (lost) biography of Pomponius Secundus.

What are we to make of this? Pliny, surely, is reliable witness. Opimian wine, then, despite Velleius, did exist in Trimalchio's day. The price seems very high for a mere seasoning, but one cannot be rational about the prices of celebrated vintages. The name was an effective advertisement, especially as snob value. We cannot say much about the ability of Roman wines to keep over long periods. Juvenal's boorish host Virro drank wine bottled in the time of the Social War[7]; Martial defies credulity with references to wines from the reign of Numa,[8] and to Massic wine of the regal period.[9] An appeal to the durability of modern wines is of limited validity, though an 1811 Château Lafite was opened at a gathering of guests in 1926 and pronounced perfect.[10]

Pliny's account does not conflict too seriously with Cicero, though the latter might well have baulked at the price Opimian wine was fetching in 39 A.D.! If Pliny is right, Velleius is wrong. Is Trimalchio exculpated from the charge of absurd pretension and ignorant bragging? To some extent, yes. But we have not lost the joke. If we follow Cicero and Pliny, then Trimalchio's *faux pas* is in his serving of an old wine now used only for a seasoning as a choice beverage by itself. One could shudderingly conjure up similar solecisms of the table today! Nor is our new interpretation of the joke too subtle. The *Arbiter Elegantiarum* (whom I equate with the author of the *Satyricon*) was surely a connoisseur, and his creations Encolpius and Ascyltos, and the guests at the *Cena* in general, are depicted as either men of taste, or men with aspirations to taste. Either way, the joke works very well.

[7] Juvenal, V, 30-1.
[8] Martial, III, 62.
[9] Martial, XIII, 111.
[10] I owe this information to L. W. Marrison, *Wines and Spirits* (Pelican Books, 1957), p. 92. J. André (*loc. cit.*) gives another example: "Un viticulteur de Nuits St. Georges déclarait avoir dégusté en 1949 un Bourgogne blanc de 1843 'encore frais et teinté et qui n'avait rien perdu'."

XXV

A NOTE ON TRIMALCHIO'S ZODIAC DISH

In their recent article on this subject,[1] Rose and Sullivan suggest that we read: *super scorpionem locustam*, *super sagittarium oculatam*, *super capricornum caprum et cornutam*, etc. This is attractive and can, I suggest, be supported by a further argument.

I propose that *locustam* be regarded as a pun on the celebrated lady poisoner of the period, Locusta.[2] According to Tacitus,[3] she was already infamous by the year 54, and continued to be a valuable tool of Nero throughout his reign.[4] Petronius is fond of puns, and the passage under discussion contains more than one.[5] And the suggested play on *locusta* may be confirmed by Trimalchio himself, a little later on, in his lecturette on astrology: *in scorpione venenarii et percussores*.[6]

This pun would be in keeping with Petronian humour. It underlines Encolpius' gloomy comment on the zodiac dish.[7] Finally, it could provide one more small argument (if any more are needed) for the traditional ascription of the *Satyricon* to Nero's Arbiter. A play on the name of the woman who provided the poison for the murders of Claudius and Britannicus, both at dinner parties, seems grimly appropriate to the context of Trimalchio's extravaganza.

[1] K. F. C. Rose and J. P. Sullivan, 'Trimalchio's Zodiac Dish', *CQ* N.S. xviii (1968), 180–4.

[2] Her name also appears as Lucusta, but this does not seem fatal to my suggestion.

[3] *Ann.* 12. 66: *nuper veneficii damnata et diu inter instrumenta regni habita*. He repeats this information in *Ann.* 13. 15.

[4] Suetonius, *Nero* 33, 47; Dio, 60. 34; 64. 3. Locusta was finally executed by Galba.

[5] See J. P. Sullivan, *The 'Satyricon' of Petronius* (Indiana University Press, 1968), 225–8.

[6] 39. 4 ff.

[7] 35. 7.

XXVI

TRIMALCHIO'S CORINTHIAN PLATE

"Nec non cocus potione honoratus est et argentea corona, poculumque in lance accepit Corinthia. Quam cum Agamemnon propius consideraret, ait Trimalchio: 'Solus sum qui vera Corinthea habeam'" (*Sat.* 50). The boast is typical of Trimalchio, and the subsequent lecture is based on two of the host's recurrent foibles: a pun and a snatch of garbled mythology. He buys his plate from Corinthus the *aerarius*, and so has the only genuine plate. But he is aware that Corinthian bronze dates back to Hannibal at the fall of Troy!

The presence of Corinthian ware on Trimalchio's table is unsurprising; indeed, an *asellus Corinthius* had already been noticed as an olive dish (*Sat.* 31). The fashion is frequently attested by Cicero in the late Republic,[1] and Augustus was notorious from his youth for being "pretiosae supellectilis Corinthiorumque praecupidus."[2]

Some, however, thought the fad had become a mania and a menace. Velleius Paterculus deplored the popularity of *Corinthia* in A.D. 30, and blamed it on the *rudis* Mummius for his sack of Corinth in 146.[3] This connection was stressed by the elder Pliny, who thought that

1. *Rosc. Am.* 133; *Verr.* 2. 2. 46, 83; *Tusc.* 2. 32; *Fin.* 2, 23; *Att.* 2. 1. 11.

2. Suet. *Aug.* 70; Octavian was allegedly dubbed *Corinthiarius* for proscribing owners of *vasa Corinthia* which he coveted. Pliny *NH* 34. 6 claims that Antony proscribed Verres for much the same reason.

3. Vell. Pat. 1. 13. 4: "non tamen puto dubites, Vinici, quin magis pro re publica fuerit manere adhuc rudem Corinthiorum intellectum quam in tantum ea intellegi, et quin hac prudentia illa imprudentia decori publico fuerit convenientior."

most devotees of Corinthian ware were ignorant chasers after fashion who could easily be fooled by counterfeit items.[4]

By contrast, the younger Pliny found Corinthian ware on the table of the respectable Vestricius Spurinna and thought it acceptable, since Vestricius followed the fashion with restraint.[5] Elsewhere,[6] Pliny mentions his own purchase of a *Corinthium signum*, bought "ex hereditate quae mihi obvenit" and destined for the temple of Jupiter at Comum. Pliny states that he will not retain the item for private delectation: "emi autem non ut haberem domi (neque enim ullum adhuc Corinthium domi habeo)."

Trimalchio's private myth of the original Corinthian ware created by Hannibal at Troy is more than a confused version of Mummius and Corinth. He is mocking both the myth and the fashion. Awareness of the myth is subtly indicated by his later mention of Mummius' bequest of one thousand cups to his patron, who in turn left them to Trimalchio (*Sat.* 52). Nor does he slavishly follow the fashion: glass and silver are more to his taste (50–51).

There may be further proof in this episode that Trimalchio is not really a sensationally rich man.[7] Corinthian ware was, to be sure, an expensive fad, but the *lanx Corinthia* in question may well have been counterfeit. It is unlikely that Trimalchio would be too lavish in rewarding a cook (unless the scene was re-enacted nightly, and the man gave the dish back to his master). Glass commends itself to him because of its cheapness (*vitrea . . . vilia*, 50). Agamemnon's close scrutiny may indicate his doubts over the authenticity of the piece. If so, Trimalchio's exposition is designed to deflect attention from the dish and also to disparage the Corinthian vogue. He admits that his preference for glass and silver may strike the audience as peculiar: "ignoscetis mihi, quod dixero: ego malo mihi vitrea" (50).

Trimalchio's lecture surprises Encolpius, who had expected that his host would merely claim to import his plate directly from Corinth, forestalls Agamemnon's demonstration of expertise, and provides a nicely logical reason for the very next incident at the *Cena* to begin: "haec dum refert, puer calicem proiecit" (52).

4. *NH* 34. 6–7: "ac mihi maior pars eorum simulare eam scientiam videtur ad segregandos sese a ceteris magis quam intellegere aliquid ibi subtilius . . . sunt ergo vasa tantum Corinthia, quae isti elegantiores modo ad esculenta transferunt, modo in lucernas aut trulleos nullo munditiarum dispectu."

5. *Epist.* 3. 1. 9: "sunt in usu et Corinthia, quibus delectatur nec adficitur."

6. *Epist.* 3. 6. 1.

7. See G. Schmeling, *CP*, LXV (1970), 248 ff.

XXVII

PETRONIUS 34. 10

Eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est.
Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus.
Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.

In earlier, independent discussion of the metrics of these lines (1), Professor H. H. Huxley and myself suggested *en passant* that *esse* might be the infinitive, not of *sum*, but of *edo*. The notion appears to have gained no support, and is altogether ignored by the latest editor of the *Cena* (2). Perhaps a more detailed consideration will lend some cogency to the idea.

There was a much-quoted dictum of Socrates to the effect that one should eat to live rather than live to eat. A typical Roman formulation of this principle is that of the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium: esse oportet ut vivas, non vivere ut edas* (4. 28. 39). Very similar versions occur in writers of all periods, Greek and Roman, pagan and Christian (3). It is worth subjoining that Quintilian (9. 3. 85) and Isidore (*Etym.* 2. 21. 11) adduce the aphorism as an example of *antimetabole*. Clearly, it was something that any educated man would come across in his studies of both philosophy and rhetoric.

Trimalchio, in spite of boasting that he had never listened to a philosopher (71. 12), was fond of playing the role of sage. The guests find it expedient to salute one of his lecturettes as superior to those of Hipparchus and Aratus (40. 1); and Encolpius elsewhere (56. 7) enjoys the covert sneer that his host *philosophos de negotio deiciebat*. Given this, it is reasonable to emphasise that the verses under discussion inspire *laudationem* (35. 1).

The sententious mood of Trimalchio is undeniable. Just prior to hitting off the poem, he had produced this reflection: *Eheu ergo diutius vivit vinum quam homuncio... vinum vita est* (34. 7). The language and thought of his verses are an obvious reprise.

In both cases, I suggest, Trimalchio is parodying or garbling the familiar Socratic utterance. The addition of wine to the thought is not inappropriate; drinking as well as eating features in the aforementioned versions of Plutarch, Gellius, and Macrobius. And the fact that the poem is postluded by the appearance of more food may support the view that *esse* was at the very least designed to be taken as a pun.

This kind of linguistic and philosophical foolery would not be unique to Petronius. Two passages from Plautus will serve as demonstration. First, *Persa* 113 *dum mane est, omnis esse mortales decet*. Then *Vidularia* 38 *misero male esse consentaneum*. The similarities of phraseology are patent. Petronius is indulging in a burlesque of a philosophical commonplace that is itself equally common (4).

---

(1) « CJ » 66 (1970/71), pp. 69-70, 234-5.

(2) M. S. Smith (Oxford 1975). And *esse* is taken to be the infinitive of *sum* in the German translation appended to the edition of K. Müller, the Loeb of Heseltine (as revised by E. H. Warmington), the Budé of Ernout, and the versions of J. P. Sullivan (Penguin) and W. Arrowsmith (Mentor).

(3) Musonius (in Stobaeus 3. 18. 37); Plutarch, *Quomodo adulesc. poet. aud. deb.* 21 E; Gellius, 19. 2; Athenaeus 4. 158 F; Diogenes Laertius 2. 34; Stobaeus 3.17. 21; Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2. 1; *Strom.* 7. 14; Macrobius, *sat.* 2. 8. 16. Cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 19. 10, for an Epicurean variant on the theme.

(4) It proves nothing, but I was happy to see that my view of these Plautine passages as parody and pun was anticipated by the compilers of the *TLL*.

XXVIII

TRIMALCHIO AND MAECENAS

That Trimalchio is in some measure modelled on Maecenas as described in the Letters of Seneca is a proposition vigorously championed and combatted in recent years (1), the argument turning on his various personal characteristics. That approach has now reached its destined dead end.

One rather different aspect seems not to have been considered (2). In 55, 5-6, a discussion of poetry prompts Trimalchio to a seemingly grotesque comparison between Cicero and Publilius, in the course of which he comes out with 16 overblown verses on the theme of luxury destined to show that Publilius was *honestiorem* as a writer.

These familiar lines, *luxuriae rictu Martis marcent moenia* etc., need not be reproduced here. Publilius is universally taken to be Publilius Syrus, the celebrated *farceur* and moralist of the late Republic (3). There has been almost equal agreement that the lines are a quotation from, or parody of, Publilius (4). Smith, however, argues convincingly that they are neither : it would be out of character for Trimalchio to recollect a passage of such length, whilst his verses do not in any way resemble the style or content of Publilius' own.

Finding some resemblances to the *Menippeae* of Varro, Smith flirts with the notion that Petronius was parodying Varro in order to make Trimalchio seem even more foolish in attributing these lines to Publilius. I think Smith is on the right lines here. However, he may have the wrong candidate.

Maecenas would fit the bill better than Varro. A specimen of his poetry preserved by Isidore, *Etym.*, 19, 32, 6, runs thus :

(1) See respectively J. P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius : a Literary Study*, Bloomington, 1968, p. 150 ; M. S. Smith's edition of the *Cena* (Oxford, 1975), p. 68-9.

(2) At all events, there seems to be no article on the matter in G. Schmeling & J. Stuckey, *A Bibliography of Petronius*, Leiden, 1977, nor in the subsequent listings in the *Petronian Society Newsletter* produced by Schmeling and others at the University of Florida, Gainsville.

(3) Though nothing would actually forbid equating him with the unknown actor Syrus imitated by Trimalchio a little earlier (52, 10) and making Trimalchio's absurdity repose in a comparison between the great Cicero and some obscure mime of a later age. Incidentally, if we suppose it to be only Cicero's poetry that is at stake, the comparison need not be quite so foolish.

(4) In addition to Sullivan and earlier critics cited by him (*op. cit.*, p. 192-3), cf. P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge, 1970, p. 127.

lucentes, mea uita, nec smaragdos
beryllos mihi, Flacce, nec nitentes
nec percandida margarita quaero
nec quos Thynica lima perpoliuit
anulos neque iaspios lapillos.

Now observe the last 8 lines of Trimalchio's effort :

quo margaritam caram tibi, bacam Indicam ?
an ut matrona ornata phaleris pelagiis
tollat pedes indomita in strato extraneo ?
zmaragdum ad quam rem uiridem, pretiosum uitrum ?
quo Carchedonios optas ignes lapideos ?
nisi ut scintillet probitas e carbunculis ?
aequum est induere nuptam uentum textilem,
palam prostare nudam in nebula linea ?

This juxtaposition sufficiently indicates the striking similarity of language and content.

Earlier on (34, 10), Trimalchio had come out with 3 limp lines on the brevity of life, the last of which runs *ergo uiuamus, dum licet esse bene*. Maecenas, in the third of his 4 verses on the same subject quoted disapprovingly by Seneca, *Ep.*, 101, 11, opined *uita dum superest, bene est*. The similarity is again eye-catching.

Maecenas was much remembered and quoted in the 1st century A.D. Of the 5 specimens of his prose (5), 2 are preserved by Seneca, 1 by Quintilian. As to the 7 sure examples of his poetry, 2 are cited by Seneca, 1 by Suetonius, whilst 2 come from the *De metris* ascribed to the friend and editor of Persius, Caesius Bassus (6). Martial's tribute, *sint Maecenates, non derunt, Flacce, Marones*, is well known. On all counts, then, Maecenas is exactly the sort of author and character who would leave a muddled but recognisable impression on Trimalchio, one that Petronius could confidently expect his own audience to catch.

(5) Recently collected and discussed by J. M. André, *Mécène écrivain*, in *ANRW*, II, 30, 3, Tübingen, 1983, p. 1765-87.

(6) Albeit the authorship of the *De metris* printed in Keil, *GL*., VI, 305-12, is a matter of dispute.

XXIX

PETRONIUS' TRYPHAENA

An interesting name, that of Tryphaena. It tends to be seen as indicative of the lady's suspect character. "Dérivé de τρύφη: mollesse, sensualité." Thus ERNOUT in his Budé edition (p. 210). The revised Loeb (p. 237, n. 1) concurs: "The name Tryphaena implies sexiness and good living."

This may very well be in order, albeit to some tastes constituting no insult to a lady. But those commentators who dub her a *meretrix* exceed due bounds. True, she is described (Sat. 101) as *omnium feminarum formosissima quae voluptatis causa huc atque illuc vectatur*. But that in itself hardly makes her a woman of ill-fame. And the passage is at serious odds with the previous one, in which Tryphaena is introduced as one carried *exulem Tarentum* in Lichas' boat.

Such an immediate discrepancy might be a reproach to the artistry of Petronius; one would prefer to blame the state of our manuscripts. We cannot tell what role (if any) Tryphaena played in the lost books. Let it be emphasised here that the seaboard frolics involving Tryphaena, Encolpius, Giton, and company do not remotely approach the carnalities of Quartilla and her party earlier in the *Satyricon*.

Those who wish to follow ERNOUT and company ought perhaps to stress that Tryphaena is a name borne by at least one of the later Cleopatras.[1] That would afford a suitable link between

[1] See PW XI, cols. 787–8, s.v. Kleopatra 25; G. MACURDY, Hellenistic Queens (Baltimore, 1932), 99.

historical fact and literary effect. However, the name of Tryphaena did not attach to *the* Cleopatra. And one will doubt whether many Romans of the Neronian era would have been capable of a swift mental equation between the name Tryphaeana and (by then) obscure Hellenistic queens.

Clearly, Tryphaena can remind one of τρυφή. But commentators may exaggerate the importance of the possible connotations of Petronian nomenclature. It is true that Encolpius' name can be made to yield a sexual meaning. Yet it was a name from real life, borne by such respectable persons as a *lector* of the younger Pliny.

Characters in a novel have to be called something. And sex is not the main preoccupation of Petronius; it is inappropriate that his creations should have been given names designed to point up sexual *entendres*.

A brief perpending of the section we call the Cena reinforces this matter. There are casual items of sexual gossip and banter, but no sexual activity. Those who ransack the Satyricon for scopomixy and the like have to go elsewhere.

Trimalchio himself may not be a gentleman by polite standards; he was not particularly active in bedrooms. True, there is evidence of one catamite, but Fortunata never upbraids him for chasing after other women. He is no effeminate, such as Juvenal's Virro. The occasional attempts to derive his name from μαλακός are out of court.[2]

Tryphaena was neither a name invented by Petronius nor one lost in the Hellenistic period. Inscriptions from Rome disclose a number of humble bearers of the name.[3] At stake is the possibility of a Tryphaena who can be securely attached to the later Julio-Claudian period. For rightly or wrongly, one approach to the question of Petronius' date is the seeking out of names in the Satyricon which can be shown to have possible

---

[2] It derives from μάλχος: that this is a Syrian word for "king" is attested by Eunapius, *Vitae sophistarum* 456, and by John Lydus, De mensibus 4. 118.

[3] E.g., CIL 6. 5035, 5343.

contemporary inspiration. Menecrates and Petraites may serve as familiar examples of what can be found.[4]

There is one Tryphaena only in *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (*PIR*) and other onomastic registers. She is Antonia Tryphaena, a creature of splendid pedigree and variegated fortunes.[5] Her father was Polemo, king of Pontus; her mother Pythodoris was a granddaughter of Antony the triumvir. Tryphaena was to have a royal husband, Cotys of Thrace. She bore three sons, who were nurtured at the court of Tiberius and assigned the three new divisions of Thrace that were created after the banishment of Cotys' murderer Rhescuporis. In the early part of Caligula's reign, she is a "widowed queen" at the games for the deified Drusilla. Religious offices were thought appropriate to one of her situation. We find her serving both in the cult of Drusilla and that of Livia and Athene Polias.

Episodes associated with this exotic relative of Caligula and Claudius are related by Tacitus and Dio;[6] neither historian elected to record the lady's name. Our knowledge of Tryphaena rests upon epigraphic evidence alone.[7] Her name will not have been one to conjure with at the court of Nero, to whom she was not related.

Petronius, however, may have heard something of her during his gubernatorial period in Bithynia, in view of her Pontic ancestry. It is just possible that her name lodged in his mind, and occurred to him when devising appellations for his characters.

One detail rescues this notion from vacuity. Antonia Tryphaena gave offerings to Poseidon Isthmius, and a statue to Poseidon upon the Tiberian restoration of part of Cyzicus. Knowledge of this could have prompted to use Tryphaena for the name of a

---

[4] Tryphaena is not discussed in the relevant sections of K. F. C. Rose, Date and Authorship of the Satyricon (Leiden, 1971).

[5] See PIR[2] A 900 for the complete details.

[6] Tacitus, Ann. 2. 64; Dio 59. 12.

[7] For which, see W. M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire before AD 170 (London, 1893), 375–428; Mommsen in Eph. Epigr. 2 (1873), 262–3; F. W. Hasluck, *Journ. of Hell. Studies* 22 (1902), 126–34; 23 (1903), 91.

female character who is to receive information concerning Giton in a dream from the mouth of a *simulacrum Neptuni* (Sat. 104).

That is one possible contemporary inspiration for the novelist's choice of name. If any is required, it should be stressed. Should the notion prove congenial to scholars, it may have a tiny part to play in the Neronian dating game.

There is an alternative. In the Pauline Epistle to the Romans, a Tryphaena is greeted, along with a Tryphosa, as a hard-working devotee of Christ.[8] These women are real people of the age of Nero. No one, I think, is going to argue that the pious pair was invented and named for their connotations here!

Which brings us ineluctably to Queen Tryphaena in the apocryphal Acta Pauli et Theklae, a pious novelette containing first and second century details and reminiscences.[9] The Tryphaena who plays an affecting role in the adventures of Thekla was long ago shown up as a character partly inspired by Antonia Tryphaena.[10]

In the Acta, Tryphaena is rich, a queen, but without friends, and bereft of her beloved daughter Falconilla.[11] It is the appearance of this latter in a dream, urging her mother to take Thekla as a surrogate daughter, which prompts Tryphaena to protect the Christian heroine against sexual violation. When watching the putative martyrdom of Thekla in the arena, Tryphaena faints, and is thought dead. This induces terror, because condign reprisal for her demise is feared from the emperor, to whom she is related. But all is well. She recovers; Thekla is saved by miraculous interventions from her doom; Tryphaena and her household are converted; she sends Thekla off with garments and gold to pursue her good works.[12]

[8] Romans 16. 12.

[9] Text in Lipsius' Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha (1959 reprint); cf. C. Schmidt, Acta Pauli (1905 —in the reprinted edition of 1965), 145 f.

[10] By Ramsay, loc. cit. (and citing earlier efforts).

[11] Devotees of Marmorale's Antonine thesis will want to stress Q. Pompeia Falconilla (PIR S 561), daughter of Quintus Pompeius Sosius Priscus (cos. 169) and perhaps sister of Q. Sosius Falco (cos. 193). It is not easy to find another Falconilla.

[12] Relevant sections of the Acta are: 27, 28, 31, 36, 39–40.

Some similarities of detail between this uplifting drama, the facts of Antonia Tryphaena's life, and the Tryphaena of the Satyricon are patent. They need not be spelled out. It is sufficient to re-read the Petronian narrative, mentally substituting Thekla for Giton. In which case, one cannot resist an earlier episode in the Acta.[13] Sent to buy bread, Paul's slave εἶδεν Θέκλαν τὴν γείτονα!

There is no suggestion that the Arbiter of Elegance devoted any time to the study of Christian Acta. In any case, he is rather early for them; unless, that is, one is drawn to MARMORALE's Antonine dating of the Satyricon. Yet Petronius could have picked up some oral Christian traditions and tales in Bithynia, perhaps even in Rome.[14] In their finished form, such pieces of martyrology as the Acta in question took on all the aspects of the Greek novel.[15] It is not inconceivable that the Tryphaena episode in the Satyricon owed the name of its heroine (saved from the shipwreck, one will not forget) and some of its details to a blend of Petronius' own creative powers, Greek literary models, Christian oral traditions,[16] and an historical Tryphaena of royal stock and varied fortunes from the Arbiter's own lifetime.

[13] Acta 23.

[14] On this, see A. CABANISS, The Satyricon and Christian Oral Tradition, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 3 (1960), 36–9; CABANISS mentioned Tryphaena as a possibility in this context, but did not elaborate an argument.

[15] See R. SÖDA, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike (Stuttgart, 1932), 126–8, for the relationship between our Acta and Greek fiction.

[16] It is worth noting the persistence of Tryphaena in this connection. Her name appears in a citation by the Suda (s.v. ἄβαξι), drawn from Symeonis Metaphrastis vitae sanctorum (Migne, PG 115. 837c).

XXX

TWO NOTES ON PETRONIUS

In *CW* 66 (1972) 19, H. C. Schnur wrote: "I would throw out two questions to which I have found no answer. Whence came the name M. Mannicius (95.3) . . . otherwise unattested? Who can explain the completely un-Roman term *imperator provinciae*?"

Good questions — but perhaps not unanswerable. First, the mysterious Mannicius. It may be true that this name is nowhere else attested; without checking every known inscription, it is impossible to be sure. But if true, it is no great cause for alarm. Petronius is exactly the sort of author in which to discern strange nomenclature. That was worth saying, but gets us no further forward. It is no surprise that the name (which occurs in the genitive in Petronius' narrative) is variously reproduced in the manuscripts. A glance at the editions of Burmann, Bücheler, and Muller (for instance) shows *Manicii, Mammicii, Mamucii, Manucii, Mannitii*, and the like. *M. Anicii* would doubtless appeal to emendors. Of editors, Burmann printed *Manicii*, whereas *Mannicii* is preferred by Bücheler, Muller, Ernout (in the Budé), and both the original and revised Loeb editions.

Mannicius could be a foreign name in Latin dress. Both *Manikkos* and *Maniagos* are worth a thought.[1] Exotic nomenclature, Hellenic or Eastern, is hardly out of place in the *Satyricon*. Yet there is a remedy nearer home. Read *Manici* with Burmann. For that name does have attestation. It cropped up in an inscription from Praeneste, published in 1872.[2]

As to the vexed *imperator provinciae*: he occurs in the tale of the Widow of Ephesus (111). It may be worth noting that apart from here and one sub-

[1] Both are registered by L. Zgusta, *Die Personennamen Griechischer Stadte Der Nordlichen Schwarzmeerkuste* (Prague 1955) 1071 and 143 respectively. The latter name might be equivalent to *Maniakos*, which would suit the violent entry of our man into Petronius' narrative.

[2] See *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 1 (1872) 79, for the brief record *L. Manici M. f.*

sequent reference to the same *imperator* (113), the noun *imperator* appears nowhere else in the *Satyricon*. Marmorale thought the phrase a Republican anachronism, taken over by Petronius from "uno scrittore dell' ĕta di Cicerone."[3] That is not impossible, if we take the *ignotus* to be a source for this particular Ephesian tale, which was established in Roman literature at least by Phaedrus' time.

However, other explanations offer. It was still possible in the Julio-Claudian period for a non-imperial individual to be at least saluted as *imperator* in the old sense. Tacitus records a notable case from the reign of Tiberius: *Blaeso tribuit ut imperator a legionibus salutaretur* (*Ann.* 3.74). For a governor to be dubbed *imperator* by provincials seems a natural enough phenomenon. And if the author of the *Satyricon* is to be equated with Nero's *arbiter*, one might suppose that he was familiar with such a habit from his own gubernatorial days in Bithynia.

Or *imperator* might be a more widespread term for a governor: a colloquialism comparable to the Plautine *imperator familiae*. Yet the way may have been shown some years ago by A. Cabaniss.[4] He pointed out that *hêgemôn* in Greek is commonly applied to governors in the New Testament, as is the cognate verb *hêgemoneuô*[5] Again, Petronius might fairly be presumed to have encountered this in his tenure of office, or in one of his Greek literary sources.

[3] *La Questione Petroniana* (Bari 1948) 100.

[4] "A Footnote to the Petronian Question," *CP* 49 (1954) 98-102; cf. his subsequent "The *Satyricon* and Christian Oral Tradition," *GRBS* 3 (1960) 36-39.

[5] *Luke* 3.1; *Matth.* 27.2, 14, 15, 21; 28.14. See the pertinent notices in F. Zorell, *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti* (Paris 1931), and J. H. Moulton-G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London 1930).

XXXI

ECHION'S PROFESSION IN THE *SATYRICON*

The last speaker in the series of monologues at Trimalchio's table is Echion the *centonarius*. English translations usually give this as « old clothes dealer » or « rag-and-bone merchant »: witness the versions of Arrowsmith, Sullivan, and the Loeb (both original and revised editions). In concord were Friedländer's « ein Fabrikant von Lappendecken » and Ernout's (in his Budé) « chiffonier ».

All of these reflect the definition of *centonarius* offered by the *Thes. l. Lat.*: « is qui centones consuit, vendit, ad incendia extinguenda et ad usus militares suppeditat ». However, the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* has changed the emphasis by rendering the word as « a fireman who used mats for extinguishing fires », an element emphasised in Konrad Müller's « ein Fabrikant von Feuerwehrrequisiten ».

Investigation is impeded by the fact that only the Petronian passage under discussion (*Sat.* 45, 1) offers *centonarius* in a literary text; Laberius, however, is credited with a mime of this title (1). Otherwise, the word is restricted to legal and inscriptional texts, which disclose the organisation of *centonarii* into formal *collegia*.

The connection between *centonarius* and *cento* seems beyond question (2). In later Rome at least, *centonarii* were rostered from members of the guilds to turn out in case of fire (3). It is credible that such was the system in the relatively small town in which Trimalchio and his guests are located. Thus, Echion's status should perhaps be altered in future translations of the *Satyricon*. But there is another point. The *centonarii* of later Rome had replaced the *vigiles*. However, when firemen burst into Trimalchio's house (*Sat.* 78, 7), they are called *vigiles*. Either the metropolitan Petronius has slipped and imported a Roman detail into pro-

---

(1) By Nonius 107, 32.

(2) Observe Tertullian, *Praescr.* 39: *qui* (sc. Homerocentonists) *more centonario ex multis hinc inde compositis in unum sarciunt corpus*; cf. Cato, *Agr.* 2, 3: *centones sarcire*. The adjective *centonarius* is not registered in the *OLD*.

(3) See R. H. Barrow, *Prefect and Emperor: the Relationes of Symmachus*, Oxford 1973, 89.

vincial life, or else *centonarius* here does not yet mean ' fireman ': which would both vindicate the traditional translation (at the expense of the *OLD*) and provide another small argument for dating the *Satyricon* early rather than late in the imperial period.

XXXII
PAX PALAMEDES

"In summo habuimus caseum mollem ex sapa et cocleas singulas et cordae frusta et hepatia in catillis et ova pilleata et rapam et senape et catillum concacatum, pax Palamedes" (Petron. *Sat.* 66.7). Friedlaender[1] took *pax Palamedes* to be an alliterative conceit. A popular explanation.[2] And it could be right, for Habinnas, the speaker, is *ebrius;* drunken jingle would be stylistically appropriate.

1. In his edition of the *Cena* (Leipzig, 1891), p. 299.

2. See, e.g., W. D. Lowe's edition of the *Cena* (Cambridge, 1905), *ad loc.*: "*pax Palamedes* is alliterative and arbitrary." Also, M. Heseltine's Loeb edition (London, 1913), p. 127: "the meaning of its [*sc. pax*'s] conjunction with the word *Palamedes* is unknown; it may merely be due to the charm of alliteration."

This interpretation is certainly preferable to that of Ernout:[3] "l'interjection sert à clore l'énumération." A masterpiece of unhelpfulness, and not even strictly true, since Habinnas' recital continues into the next two sentences. Nor were we much helped by Sedgwick,[4] who absolved himself from the need to comment by expurgating the passage.

At the other end of the scale, Crum[5] took the phrase to allude to Nero: Palamedes was a son of Nauplius, and the latter was once the theme of a Nero recital. This notion, scouted by Rose,[6] is not impossible (very little is, when it comes to Nero-hunting in the *Satyricon*[7]), but neither does it attract, since the context of *pax Palamedes* hardly suggests a recognizable allusion to the emperor.

Between the meaningless and the significant, more attractive than both, is the explanation of Sullivan.[8] He connects the phrase to the story of Palamedes' death at the hands of Ulysses: *pax Palamedes* reflects Ulysses' happy exclamation when the deed was done.

That is almost right. For *catillum concacatum* (if this is what Petronius wrote[9]) does not sound very appetizing and well merits an adverse comment. Yet it might be objected that *catillum concacatum* was a slang expression for some familiar or trendy dish, with no pejorative connotation. And Habinnas' recollection of his meal is a happy one; he does not seem to be wishing its creator dead.

There is another possibility. In Aristophanes *Ranae* 1451, Dionysus greets Euripides' suggestions on Athenian policy with the sardonic words, *εὖ γ' ὦ Παλάμηδες, ὦ σοφωτάτη φύσις*. The stress is on Palamedes the inventor. This suits the *Satyricon* perfectly, with its plethora of novel comestibles. One also recollects that there was a story which had Palamedes relieve a famine in the Greek fleet at Aulis.[10] Hence the phrase suits Habinnas, whether he is praising or deploring the *catillum concacatum*.

Pax Palamedes might be a Romanized version of Aristophanes' interjection. Either, or both, may have been proverbial. And *pax* is really the Greek *πάξ*. Which is convenient to the argument, for (fortuitously or otherwise) extant examples of *πάξ* occur in contexts of food.[11] Also, Palamedes the inventor was utilized by Eupolis[12] in a joke concerning the invention of chamber pots by Alcibiades. This detail would enhance the theory of Averil Cameron[13] that Habinnas' entry is a conscious parody of Alcibiades' epiphany in the *Symposium* of Plato.

3. In his Budé édition (Paris, 1922), *ad loc.*

4. In his second "edition" of the *Cena* (Oxford, 1950).

5. R. H. Crum, "Petronius and the Emperors," *CW*, XLV (1952), 161 f.

6. K. F. C. Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leyden, 1971), pp. 84–85.

7. Rose, pp. 82–86, registers about ninety supposed allusions.

8. J. P. Sullivan, in his Penguin translation (Baltimore, 1965), p. 191, n. 53. He translates the phrase, "good riddance to that." W. Arrowsmith rendered it, "but enough's enough" in his Mentor version (New York, 1959), p. 72.

9. *Concacatum* is really Burman's improvement on the *concagatum* of H. His adducing of the Greek *ἀνθύλευσις* is pertinent both to the text and to my argument in the latter part of this paper. G. Bagnani, *Arbiter of Elegance* (Toronto, 1954), p. 80, compared *concacatum* to *omnia concacavit* in Seneca(?) *Ludus* 4. 3—an irrelevance.

10. See, e.g., the scholiast on Eur. *Or.* 432.

11. Earlier editions of Liddell & Scott cited only Diphilus from Ath. 2. 67D; the *Supplement* (Oxford, 1968) added *Anth. Pal.* 5. 181 (Asclepiades). In both passages, *πάξ* is countered by *τίπαξ*.

12. Frag. 351 (Edmonds, *Frag. Att. Com.*, I [Leyden, 1957], 430).

13. "Petronius and Plato," *CQ*, LXIII (1969), 367 f. See also P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 40.

XXXIII

PIGICIACA SACRA.

A FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM IN PETRONIUS?

Eumolpus, qui tam frugi erat ut illi etiam ego puer viderer, non distulit puellam invitare ad pigiciaca sacra (*Sat.* 140, 5). The girl in question is the daughter of Philomela, left along with her brother in the house of Eumolpus as a pawn in the maternal game of *captatio*.

The problem is, to what does the old reprobate invite her? *Pigiciaca* would seem an obvious Graecism for sodomy; it was so understood by the hand which wrote πυγησιακὰ in the margin of *l* (1). Yet there has been a plethora of obelisings, emendings, and « explanations ». For all of which, Bücheler is essentially to blame. Proclaiming that buttocks and buggery were *ab hoc loco alienissima*, he came up with two suggestions about as limp as Encolpius himself was in attendance at this scene. Bücheler's proposals were *physica* or *Aphrodisiaca*, the second of which has been unfortunately adopted into his text by Konrad Müller.

Of other suggestions, *Isiaca* (deposed by Valesius) is the one most commonly reported by editors. The original Loeb of Heseltine printed *pigiciaca* without any sign of concern, but as this is one of the many passages left in « the decent obscurity of Latin », perturbation would anyway have been otiose. In his revised version of the Loeb, E. H. Warmington obelised *pigiciaca*, referring in his note to the aforementioned notions of Bücheler and Valesius. Ernout, with true Gallic nonchalance, exploited the marginal gloss for his Budé edition, and printed *pygesiaca*.

Unsurprisingly for our times, the philological side of the question has been of less concern than the erotological. Is the intercourse between Eumolpus and the girl anal or vaginal? Weinrich (2) took the former view, as does Schmeling (3) in his important paper on the *exclusus amator* motif in Petronius. On the other side (as it were), Christopher Gill (4) has accepted the comment, though not the reading, of Bücheler. No help is provided by the recent books of Walsh (5) or (more surprisingly) Sullivan (6). The whole issue, like Eumolpus himself, is up in the air.

Lack of a parallel is never good reason for expelling a locution from the *Satyricon*. Graecisms are a natural ingredient of a picaresque narrative set in Southern Italy. I have somé sympathy with the view that *pigiciaca* is a non-problem, a Greek word in Latin dress, or comic neologism on Petronius' part, meaning exactly what it should mean. However, modish dubiety provokes some further exploration.

Buttocks are not so remote from the situation as Bücheler asserted. True,

---

(1) I use *l*, in the manner of modern editors, to denote the codex Leidensis Scaligeranus 61, rather than the *L* of Bücheler, which is better reserved for the entire tradition of class *L*.

(2) In his *Martial XI 43, Petronius 140, 5, and Pariser Zauberpapyrus z. 326*, « RhM » 77 (1928), p. 112.

(3) G. Schmeling, *The* Exclusus Amator *Motif in Petronius, Fons Perennis* (Turin 1971), p. 333.

(4) C. Gill, *The Sexual Episodes in the* Satyricon, « CP » 68 (1973), p. 172.

(5) P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge 1970).

(6) J. P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius* (Indiana 1968).

the sexual narrative which follows is a *tour de force* of aerial loving which does not make clear which orifice Eumolpus employs. The girl is simply besought *ut sederet super commendatam bonitatem;* that brought delight to her, but no instruction for us. However, the sequence begins with a reminder of Eumolpus' taste for boys; and it is terminated with an unsuccessful effort by Encolpius on the rectum of the girl's brother.

The atmosphere is sodomitic. It usually is when Eumolpus is around. His advent into the *Satyricon* (making due allowance for the lacunose state of the text at that point) is marked by his recounting of his seduction of the Pergamene boy (7). And it is also Eumolpus who gives us the anecdote of the Widow of Ephesus as one of his *multa in muliebrem levitatem* (8). Given the condition of our text, there can be no certain dogma. But on what we have, Eumolpus is an inveterate pederast, with no obvious bisexual leanings.

Sodomy between man and woman is common enough in Martial and other Roman literature (9). It may be appropriate to stress that it occurs in Apuleius between Fotis and the narrator, at the girl's instigation (10). Heterosexual sodomy also features in a Greek magical papyrus, where the man prefers *culus* to *cunnus* (11). It is not a usual motif in Petronius, but that (for the usual reason) proves nothing.

Eumolpus would have been best pleased if left with the boy rather than the girl. But anyone so sexually *frugi* as to be able to regard Encolpius as a *puer* could easily accommodate himself to a female sphincter. In one sense, the argument is over.

Yet there is a residual problem, largely unnoticed in the commentaries. Philomela left her daughter *cum fratre ephebo in cubiculo*. Why did Eumolpus not take the boy rather than the girl? The youth was soon willing to accept the vain overtures of Encolpius, so need not be deemed too prudish. However, in some way not explained in the narrative, the boy is got out of the bedroom, for when Encolpius attempts him, he is watching his sister in action *per clostellum*, which appears (12) to mean key-hole. Either the narrative of Petronius is a shade careless, or there is something missing from the text, or *clostellum* does not mean key-hole.

Finally, for those who cannot accept *pygiciaca* in whatever language or sexual sense, two alternative notions. Valesius' *Isiaca* could be a good bet. It is achieved with no great palaeographical violence and, as Gill notices, would (with the aid of *sacra*) provide ironic counterpoint to the preceeding sentence, in which Philomela goes off *in templum ad vota nuncupanda*. Roman suspicions about sexual goings-on in temples (13), Egyptian (14) in particular, are too familiar to be registered. We should, however, notice a fairly close parallel in sense and language in Juvenal: *aut aput Isiacae potius sacraria lenae* (15).

I also toy with *ischiaca*. The word exists in both Greek and Latin dress. Gouty rites suit the current image of Eumolpus as a man *podagricum lumborumque solutorum*. This might involve the deletion of *sacra* as a gloss. *Sed*, the first word of the next sentence, would be more of a problem, since an exegetic *nam* would be needed rather than the adversative. Could *sed* be the false

---

(7) *Sat.* 85.
(8) *Sat.* 110 f.
(9) See Schmeling, pp. 354-5.
(10) *Met.* III 20.
(11) See the cited references to Schmeling and Weinrich.
(12) *Clostellum* (presumably for *claustellum*) seems unique to this passage.
(13) See, e.g., Vergil, *Ecl.* 3, 7-9.
(14) See T. Birt, *Marginalien zu lateinischen Prosaikern*, « Philologus » 83 (1928), p. 47. Birt was inspired by his erudition on these matters to suggest *Aegyptiaca* for our present passage.
(15) *Sat.* 6, 488.

product of the following propinquity of *podagricum* and *se*, which have the letters s, e. and d? We could get along without a *nam*, simply reading *et podagricum*... If called to account for the p in *pigiciaca*, I would wonder if *pigra* once accompanied *ischiaca*, either in the original or, more likely, as a marginal note.

Such a reading would, perhaps happily, involve Petronius in a little spoofing of motifs, tantamount to his parodies of the *exclusus amator*. For excess of pleasure often brings physical disaster in its train, at least in moralising texts. According to Strato, and the protagonist of the *Musa Puerilis* can fairly be summoned as an expert witness, gout can be the consequence of pedication (16).

(16) *A.P.* XII 243 (though the textual corruption in the second line of the distich reduces the value of this poem as evidence for anything concrete; its main drift, however, is clear enough).

XXXIV

PENTHIACUM: A CULINARY TERM IN PETRONIUS

At *Satyricon* 47.10, Trimalchio proclaims: *Quem ex eis* (sc. *porcis*) *vultis in cenam statim fieri? gallum enim gallinaceum penthiacum et eiusmodi nenias rustici faciunt: mei coci etiam vitulos aeno coctos solent facere.*

The word *penthiacum* occurs nowhere else in extant Latin literature. It is not registered by Lewis & Short, and was neglected by the older dictionaries of Stephanus and Forcellini; the present note may help to ensure its presence in the future relevant volumes of the *TLL* and *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.

Reinesius conjectured *phasiacum*, needlessly. Friedländer and Bücheler both saw the dish as inspired by the dismemberment of Pentheus in the *Bacchae*. This seems plausible enough, although the most recent editor[1]) of the *Cena* is hesitant about the etymology. The aforementioned German scholars both adduce the line *est Bromio Pentheus, est et mihi de bove Pentheus* from that late confection, the *Iudicium coci et pistoris* (Reise, *Anth. Lat.* 1.99.77). This is pertinent, and may suggest Petronian influence.

Penthiacum would appear to be a fricassee, for which the technical term in Apicius is *minutal*. It is notable that a number of recipes for this dish in the *De re coquinaria* are named for various Romans (see, e.g., 4.3.2–4). Possibly Petronius was parodying this form of gourmet's vanity.

It can be here subjoined that Trimalchio's distinction between rustic and sophisticated fare is well contrived. The *gallus gallinaceus* smacks of unrefined living: there are no recipes for any sort of *gallus* in Apicius. On the other hand, *vitulos aeno coctos* in a boast inspired by the advent of pigs brings recollection of the Apician dish *porcellum aenococtum*[2]) (8.7.11).

Apart from his obvious desire to supply Trimalchio with a colourful crudity, Petronius may have been inspired to his creation by two further artistic reasons. According to Athenaeus (*Deip.* 8.362e), the Dionysiac noun *θίασος* was synonymous with *ἔρανος*, denoting a banquet got together by the mutual love and contributions of

---

[1]) M. S. Smith (Oxford, 1975), 128. The revised Loeb edition of E. H. Warmington also makes the Pentheus connection.

[2]) Which justifies the retention of the traditional reading *aeno coctos* in the present passage against Smith's *oeno coctos*.

all the guests. That would be a grimly effective joke in the context of Pentheus. Athenaeus indeed may have been aware of this possibility, for in his very next sentence a line from the *Bacchae* is, in fact, quoted. Given that Pentheus was slaughtered in the country, a dish named for him is appropriate to the *rustici* disparaged by Trimalchio.

Secondly, Trimalchio makes his comments as an immediate follow-up to the last of the series of monologues by his guests. It is striking that the speaker thus postluded by the host is Echion—which name was of course borne in Greek mythology by the father of Pentheus!

JUVENAL

XXXV

COVER-NAMES AND DEAD VICTIMS IN JUVENAL

There are two striking anti-climaxes in the First Satire of Juvenal. It may or may not be significant that the first occurs almost half-way through the poem whilst the second forms the poem's conclusion. Both passages are vitally important, since they are expounding his satirical method. Yet both are notoriously enigmatic. The most detailed and ingenious explanation of their difficulties is that of Gilbert Highet (1); he is followed, in essentials, by Sir Ronald Syme (2). Persuasive as Highet is, however, I do not find his arguments relating to the problems of the First Satire cogent or logical. Nor have all the difficulties been faced, alas! The aim of this paper is to present my objections to Highet and Syme, and to suggest a new possible explanation for the concluding two lines of the poem.

The two passages are:

(a) *Si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*
qualemcunque potest, quales ego vel Cluvienus. (79-80)

(b) *Experiar quid concedatur in illos*
quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina. (170-171)

These two passages are obviously connected; both refer to Juvenal's concept of Satire. They are not, of course, the only such passages in this poem (3).

---

(1) G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist*; all references are to the 1962 (Oxford) edition. I do not wish my criticisms in this paper to conceal my fundamental admiration for Highet's book. See also his *Anatomy of Satire* (Princeton, 1962).

(2) R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), pps. 449-500; 776-778.

(3) Other passages are: 17-18; 30; 51; 85-87; 147 ff.. All of these are preceded or followed by a set-piece of denunciation.

The first passage cited is the basis for Highet's celebrated theory of covernames in Juvenal (4). Cluvienus is an unknown and meaningless name, as obscure to the scholiast as it is us. Why does Juvenal end a very strong passage of invective and protest in this limp fashion? Highet's theory is that Cluvienus is a cover-name, inserted into the published edition of the poem to replace the name of a real contemporary poet who was mentioned in the original when it was recited to an audience. Therefore, one looks, not for a Cluvienus, but for a poet whose name will fit the metrical position in the line. Highet has two such suggestions (5). After a detailed study of the prosopography of the Satires, Highet concludes that Juvenal sometimes attacked real coevals under appropriately metrical cover-names, but also stigmatises real names of influential people, especially people connected with the circle of Pliny.

The second passage is translated by Highet as follows: « I' 11 try what may be said against the men whose ashes lie beside the highways north and south ». Since Juvenal ends the poem on this note, its message must be an important pointer to is satirical programme. Highet (6) is rightly concerned, observing: « The satire ends, not with a bang but a whisper. The last point is a very strange one, which would have repaid some development ». Is Juvenal saying that he is going to restrict his attacks to the dead? The language may seem to imply this. If so, Highet is right to point out that this would be a break with the Roman satirical tradition, also that it is not a very promising satirical technique for one who professes in this same poem to follow Lucilius and Horace (7).

How dead are these victims? The position is complicated by the fact that we do not know when Juvenal published his Satires.

---

(4) *Op. cit.*, 289-294.

(5) He suggests the names of *Decianus* and *Julius Cerealis*. Both are mentioned by Martial in a friendly way (1. 61.10; 11. 52. 1 ff.). To us, they are as obscure as *Cluvienus*.

(6) *Op. cit.*, 56-58.

(7) For Juvenal's claim to emulate Lucilius see: 19-20; 165-168. For Horace: 51. Highet, however, exaggerates in saying that this would be a « new invention » of Juvenal. Horace did the same. See N. Rudd, *The Names in Horace's Satires*, C.Q. (New Series, Volume X, Number 2, 1960), pps. 161-178.

Opinions vary. Highet argues for a date of c. 110 for the first Book of Satires ([8]); Syme declares that « there is no proof that Juvenal published anything before the death of Trajan » ([9]).

Internal evidence does not help much. For example, the conviction and exile of Marius Priscus is alluded to in a famous passage in the First Satire([10]). It is well known that this event occurred in 100; the conviction was secured through the efforts of Pliny and Tacitus ([11]). However, in Satire Eight, for which Highet suggests a publication date of c. 120, Marius' depredations are referred to as recent ([12]). Although it is impossible to define the chronological scope of the word *nuper,* yet it is clear that internal evidence from the Satires is of little value.

Attacks on the recently deceased would be in the tradition of Roman Satire. Seneca's skit on the deification of Claudius is an obvious precedent ([13]); Horace does not scruple to attack the dead in his *Sermones* ([14]). The trouble is the absence of any consistency in Juvenal's method. The First Satire is most relevant to the argument. It exhibits a Rogues' Gallery drawn from the reign of Domitian ([15]), goes back to the reign of Nero, moves forward again

---

([8]) *Op. cit.*, 11-12.

([9]) *Op. cit.*, 500.

([10]) 49-50.

([11]) Plin., *Ep.* 2. 11.

([12]) 8. 120: *Cum tenuis nuper Marius discinxerit Afros?*

([13]) On the authorship and date of this pamphlet, see my article *Executions under Claudius: Seneca's Ludus de Morte Claudii*, Phoenix (Volume 18, 1964, 1), 39-48.

([14]) See Rudd, *art. cit.*, 164-166.

([15]) These include the Egyptian Crispinus (26-40), who reappears as the villain of the first part of the Fourth Satire; Massa and Carus. These two latter are presumably Carus Mettius and Massa Baebius who are both mentioned by Tacitus (*Agricola* 45). It is notable that both were enemies of Pliny, which may pose difficulties for the theory that Juvenal takes special delight in attacking Pliny's circle. According to Pliny (*Ep.* 7. 27), Carus had laid charges against him before Domitian; the relevant papers were found in Domitian's files after 96. In 93, Pliny and Herennius Senecio prosecuted Massa for misconduct in his province of Hispania Baetica (*Ep.* 7. 33). Pliny's account is contained in a letter to Tacitus, for inclusion in the latter's *Historiae.*

to Priscus in 100, and advances to the close of Trajan's reign with a nasty allusion to Gillo (16).

The references to villains of Nero's time are two-fold. Locusta, the celebrated poisoner is mentioned as a prototype of women who poison their husbands (17). This is clear enough. The second reference, however, is much more perplexing than commentators allow. It brings in an apparent allusion to Ofonius Tigellinus, the infamous Prefect of Nero's later years. The passage is as follows (18):

unde illa priorum
'scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet
simplicitas? « cuius non audeo dicere nomen?
quid refert dictis ignoscat Mucius an non? »
pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa,
qua stantes ardent, qui fixo pectore fumant,
ut latum media sulcum dent lucis harena.'
qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita, vehatur
pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos?

In this section, Juvenal is discussing the satirical techniques of Lucilius, and also the dangers facing himelf as a satirist. The reference to Mucius is taken to allude to the Mucius Scaevola attacked by Lucilius (19). The Tigellinus reference, then, is a contrast. But to what effect? Mucius is a long dead Roman. But Tigellinus had been dead since the reign of Otho; in fact he deceased in remarkably inglorious circumstances (20). In view of his notoriety, why on earth should Juvenal claim that it is dangerous to expose him? The usual answer is that Tigellinus is intended as a type; he symbolises the sort of man it is dangerous to criticise.

There are two objections to this, which seem little noticed. First, it spoils the sense of the following lines. The word *ergo* surely requires the opposite sense. The anonymous triple poisoner is not going to be granted impunity. To make coherent sense, the Tigellinus reference ought to carry the same meaning as the

---

(16) Gillo is coupled with Proculeius as a gigolo (40-41). For his identity, see later.
(17) 69-72.
(18) 151-159.
(19) Lucilius' attacks on Mucius became proberbial. See PERSIUS, 1. 114-5.
(20) His forced suicide is described by TACITUS, *Hist.* 1. 72.

Mucius allusion. Secondly, the text of the Tigellinus passage is very uncertain. The Pithoeanus manuscript (P) reads *Tigillinum*, with an emendation by one of the correcting hands. This might not mean anything at all. But, if Tigillinus were a possible name, we would be faced with a very different problem. I do not, in general, favour such speculations; to replace an historical character by an otherwise unknown and dubious name is very dangerous. But I am tempted in this case, because the new name would provide an effective double pun. The paronomasia involves the word *tigillum* (« a little beam or log of wood »), and the word *Tigillus* which is an epithet of Juppiter (21). In the context of burning, the first of these puns is especially effective. Moreover, there are more textual problems. P. reads *lucebit* for *lucebis*, and *deducit* for the conjectural *dent lucis* (22). If we retain the readings of P., the manuscript generally regarded (*pace* Housman) as the best one for Juvenal, then the passage conforms to my first point. It gives the sense required by the preceding Mucius passage and the following *ergo*.

What, now, of the last two lines of the poem? The convention is to take them as indicating that Juvenal intends to attack the dead. But it is very obvious that he does not do this as a matter of course. Ironically, this is best demonstrated by Highet and Syme(23), the two scholars who accept the convention. Is the statement a lie? If so, it is an incredibly clumsy one. It is placed at the end of his first Satire, a poem setting out his satirical techniques and motives, a poem which very obviously does not restrict itself to dead victims; not, at any rate, on Highet's suggested datings!

I suggest that these two lines do not mean the Juvenal is going to attack the dead as a principal satirical device. Rather is the passage descriptive of the nobles. He is going to attack those

---

(21) Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei*, 7.11.

(22) I have printed the Oxford Text of Owen; *dent lucis* is his conjecture.

(23) See Highet, 289-294; Syme, 664-5; 777-8. They both see, in Juvenal's Gillo, the proconsul of Asia for 115-6, Q. Fulvius Bittius Proculus. Also, they equate Hispo, attacked for his vices in Satire 2.50, with T. Caepio Hispo who was proconsul of Asia for 118-119. In view of this, I find it hard to understand why Syme concludes: « Juvenal does not attack any person or category that commands influence in his own time ».

Romans who are buried along the Flaminian and Latin ways *when* thei are dead In other words, the sense is generic, not temporal(24).

Ironically, I think I may claim that this suggestion would be consistent with the usual interpretation of the Tigellinus passage! The contrast would then be: you can attack the nobles (men like Mucius, or the Lamiae (25)), but not these ignoble upstarts such as Tigellinus (26).

This brings us back to Cluvienus and Highet's theory of cover-names. Now, the use of cover-names would not be peculiar to Juvenal. Horace has been shown to do this (27). But the major objection to Highet is best expressed in a question: What was Juvenal afraid of? Even if we grant that Cluvienus is a cover-name, why on earth should Juvenal be afraid of an obscure poetaster? Especially since, on Highet's own showing, Juvenal attacks prominent men such as Gillo and Hispo, and is allegedly devoted to attacks on the circle of Pliny. Under Trajan, what faction was more influential than the Pliny circle?

The parallel wth the conventions of Latin Love Poetry (Clodia = Lesbia, etc.) is not exact; concealing or protecting a lady's name in Love Poetry is rather different from refraining from naming an allegedly bad poet in a viciously satirical piece such as the First Satire.

Nor do I think that a political reason can be adduced to explain why Juvenal should have recourse to such extremities. It is true that satirists had suffered censorship under the Principate (28), though occasionally an Emperor would be aston-

---

(24) At first, I thought that this suggestion might be invalidated by the indicative *tegitur*. But in view of metrical considerations, and indicatives such as Catullus' *cui dono lepidum novum libellum* (1.1.; see Fordyce *ad locum*), and the common *quid ago*?, my fears are allayed.

(25) For the Lamiae see *Satire* 4.154, and Highet, 293.

(26) The problem of Crispinus is not solved by this. He is Juvenal's favourite whipping-boy, and is described (4.32) as *princeps equitum*. We have no corroboration of this from other sources. Highet (260) and J. D. Duff (*ad locum*) think that he was *praefectus praetorio* with Fuscus; but Highet also wonders about the possibility that Crispinus is a cover-name.

(27) See Rudd, *art. cit.*, 170-172.

(28) The most notable case was that of Fabricius Veiento, who was exiled by Nero in 62 for satirising senators and priests; the offending satires were ordered to be burned (Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.50). However, Veiento later

ishingly lenient ([29]). Yet, according to Highet, Juvenal published the First Satire in the reign of Trajan. His fears seem strangely at odds with the new confidence of Tacitus in the regime ([30]). The discrepancy is the more striking in view of Tacitus' own alleged experiences under Domitian, and his treatment of that Emperor's reign in his own writings. My point is not conclusive, I grant, since we are dealing with two individual writers who could have reacted in different ways to Trajan's regime; especially if it is true that Juvenal does not like the Pliny - Tacitus circle. But there is a real difficulty here, created rather than solved by the Highet theory.

A final point on cover-names It is hard to see the logic in Highet's suggestion that Juvenal used a real name in his recitations, but substituted a cover-name in the Published version. Granting that personal allusions were dangerous, was it really less hazardous to make such allusions in open readings? Not if we accept Juvenal's own picture of a Rome filled with *delatores* who could convict a person for a single incautious word! ([31]).

It is relevant to consider briefly another Roman satirical poem whch raises the issue of the satirist's position in Rome. I refer, of course, to the first poem in the Second Book of Horace's *Sermones* ([32]). This poem, dated to c. 30 B.C., poses this issue in the form of a debate between Horace and the jurist Trebatius Testa. There is no need to suggest that Juvenal is too consciously following this as a model, but there are some notable similarities of detail. Horace, for example, clams that he will attack dead vic-

---

emerged as a powerful figure under the Flavians and appears in Domitian's cabinet in Juvenal's Fourth Satire (113; 123 ff.). To the disgust of Pliny (*Ep.* 4.22) he could still appear as a favoured dinner guest of the Emperor Nerva.

([29]) Suetonius, *Nero* 39, observes that that Emperor even refused to allow very severe punishment of some authors of lampoons against him, even though the latters' names had been brought before the Senate by informers.

([30]) *Agricola* 3; *Hist.* 1.1: *Rara temporum felicitate ubi sentire quae velis et quae sentias dicere licet.*

([31]) *Satire* 1.160 - 161.

([32]) See 39-46, and the discussion by Rudd, *art. cit.*; also see Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 145 ff.

tims (33). Juvenal also raises the issue in dialogue form, not a favourite device of his (34). Like Horace, he invokes Lucilius, not that this is very significant. Like Horace, he rejects the suggestion that Epic is a safer genre, though it may be worth observing that Juvenal does not suggest to himself that he chronicle the exploits of the Emperor. Juvenal's opinions of contemporary epic effusions are no secret, of course! Again, it may just be worthwhile noting that, earlier in the First Satire, Juvenal invokes Horace as a satirical model (35).

All this may not add up to much. It is never difficult to remark similarities of detail in the line of Roman Satire, from Lucilius to Horace and thence to Persius and Juvenal. Also, the political conditions in the Rome of Horace were much different from those obtaining in Juvenal's Rome. Does this account for the optimism of Horace's poem, in which he is confident of winning a legal battle over his work, whereas Juvenal, on the traditional explanation of the conclusion of his First Satire, is too frightened openly to attack the living? The answer is not so glib as it might be assumed. Horace had no guarantee that Octavian (as he then was) would be so indulgent towards Satire (36). And Juvenal's attitude is unnatural for a writer publishing in the reign of Trajan or Hadrian. That is, if we can accept the accolade of Tacitus on the new freedom allowed to writers by the regime.

To conclude. Juvenal may have used cover-names, and he may have attacked dead victims. The latter, in fact, is certain. He has no consistent method. Neither had Horace. Yet it is very hard to see why Juvenal felt the need to conceal attacks on a poetaster, when he openly mentioned Priscus, the Lamiae, Gillo, and Hispo. The suggestion that cover-names were employed for the published editions, not in the original recitations of the poems, is inconsistent with the poet's own picture of the activities of delatores. We can never be quite sure whether a victim was alive or dead, since we do

---

(33) It must be significant that this poem is in the form of a dialogue with a legal man.

(34) Highet, 169 ff.; 274.

(35) *Satire* 1.51: *Haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?*

(36) Not, at any rate, if we recall the imminent fate of Cornelius Gallus, and the tradition that Vergil's intended praise of him in *Georgic* 4 was changed accordingly. The later case of Ovid might be relevant also.

not know when the Satires were published. The final two lines of the First Satire do not have to mean that Juvenal is going to restrict his attacks to the dead. They may imply that he feels safe to attack nobles such as the Lamiae and officials such as Gillo (a *novus homo*?), but has reservations about criticising low-born favourites, praetorian guards, and the like. This would satisfy the requirements of the conventional explanation of the Tigellinus passage, and also the old tradition about Juvenal and Paris. On the other hand, it is just possible that the Tigellinus reference does not allude to Nero's court, as I have argued. Certainly, the state of the text gives no grounds for confidence for any interpretation. However, if my explanation of the last two lines is possible, it gives better sense and coherence to the Mucius-Tigellinus-anonymous poisoner passage.

SUNTO. — An analysis of the First Satire suggests that Juvenal was bolder in his attacks on living people than is maintained by Gilbert Highet and Sir Ronald Syme. The poet Cluvienus need not be a cover name, as Highet suggests. Juvenal is willing to attack influential men, such as Gillo and the Lamiae, by name. Hence, the traditional interpretation of the final two lines of the First Satire may be wrong. Juvenal's aim is to attack, not just the dead, but members of the Roman aristocracy alive in his day. The sense of the last line is generic, not temporal. The text of the passage concerning Tigellinus is analysed. In view of the textual difficulties, and the context, it is suggested that the passage may not refer to Nero's *Praefectus*, but to a person and event of Juvenal's own lifetime. Juvenal's satirical methods are compared to those of Horace; the political milieu of Juvenal and Tacitus is discussed, and Highet's proposed chronology for Juvenal's poems is shown to be insecure.

XXXVI

THREE CHARACTERS IN JUVENAL

1. Juvenal's Shadowy Friend

Did the Umbricius of *Satire 3* exist? The name is suspiciously appropriate; flight to the rustic solitudes of Cumae conjures up atmospheric *umbra*, and the poem concludes with a sunset.[1] Yet the name is real enough. There is epigraphic attestation[2] and literary corroboration. According to the elder Pliny, an Umbricius was *haruspicum in nostro aevo peritissimus;*[3] and it was an Umbricius who announced *tristia exta* to Galba in 69.[4] Both references provide a neat joke, since Juvenal's friend parades his ignorance of haruspicy: *ranarum viscera numquam/inspexi.*[5]

Connection with Martial is unlikely. True, the Spaniard addressed *Epigr.* 12.18 to a certain *Juvenalis,*[6] in which he waxed on rural delights. One detail mentioned is the informality of dress: *ignota est toga . . . .*[7] Juvenal incorporates the theme: *nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus.*[8] But rural pleasures are standardised in Roman poetry; the detail is a commonplace, unless a touch of parody be supposed. Umbricius is not easily equated with Martial. The poet was not Italian, and Umbricius' xenophobia would be tactless in context. Also, Martial was more adept at sponging off grandees: he touched Pliny for his fare home.[9] Nor would Martial's sexual proclivities, such as bucolic paederasty, have suited the professed austerity of Juvenal. Finally, if Highet's theory[10] of animosity between Juvenal and the Pliny circle is followed, Umbricius will not have stood for a Spaniard so highly thought of by Pliny.

The matter cannot be resolved. One doubts that Juvenal had many friends, though addressees begin to occur in the later poems. There is nothing un-Juvenalian about Umbricius' diatribe, and he might have been invented simply as a dramatic variant from the satirist's own spleen in the first poem. But no one can prove that Juvenal did not have a friend called Umbricius, whose name is inserted *honoris causa*. The name is suspiciously shadowy, but rare in Roman poetry,[11] and there could have been a real Umbricius whose nomenclature was employed by Juvenal because it was perfectly suited to his theme. A lucky coincidence, but surely not an impossible one.

[1] On the imagery, see A. L. Motto and J. R. Clark in *TAPA* 96 (1965) 267f., where attempts to confirm Umbricius' historical authenticity are rejected.

[2] *CIL* 10.3141-2; 11.2504 (the female form *Umbricia*); see also *PW* 9.1827, and G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford 1954) 253-54.

[3] *NH* 10.6.19.

[4] Tacitus *Hist.* 1.27.

[5] *Sat.* 3.44-45.

[6] See Friedlaender on *Epigr.* 7.24.

[7] Lines 17-18.

[8] *Sat.* 3.172.

[9] Pliny *Ep.* 3.21.

[10] *Op. cit.* 290f.

[11] Juvenal's friend is the only Umbricius listed in D. C. Swanson, *The Names in Roman Verse* (Wisconsin 1967) 341.

2. Cordus Versus Codrus

Sat. 1. 2: *vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi*
Sat. 3.203: *lectus erat Cordo Procula minor*
Sat. 3.208: *nil habuit Cordus, quis enim negat?*

Cordus or Codrus? They jostle for supremacy in the manuscripts, but Cordus has won the day at 1.2. He is favoured by Clausen, Duff, Friedlaender, Hardy, Housman, Mayor, and Owen.[12] The position is reversed at 3.203, 208; only Clausen finds a place for Cordus. However, Codrus was expelled from this latter passage some years ago in a detailed and trenchant note by J. G. Griffith.[13]

Cordus and Codrus are a troublesome pair; they also vie for recognition in Lucan 8.715. Oddly enough, Martial's Cordus seems unchallenged on five appearances, save for one trumpery incursion by *Cordex* on to the territory of *Corde.*[14] The betting at Juvenal 1.2 is firmly on Cordus. The name is respectably Roman, registered in the class *ex casu nascentium* by Quintilian,[15] and occurs more than once in Martial and Tacitus. Codrus has virtually no sanction, epigraphic or literary.[16] And Cordus' name may mean "born out of season,"[17] which would give added point to Juvenal's sneer at the unseasonable bawlings of an epic poetaster.

Yet such semantic niceties give Codrus a straw at which to clutch. Griffith suggested that Codrus owed his intervention at 1.2 to the proximity of Theseus and the other Greek names. A good point, but to whom is Codrus indebted: the scribes or Juvenal? It might have suited Juvenal's taste for mythological jests to make a Codrus devote a bad epic to Theseus. And Codrus might be a poet's pseudonym.[18]

The presence of Cordus at 1.2 does not, in spite of Griffith, preclude Codrus' survival at 3.203, 208. The little man and his diminutive furnishings need not be the epic poet of 1.2. He has a collection of Greek texts (Greek, not Latin), but that does not make him a poet; remember Trimalchio and his libraries. Codrus is preceded by the epic figure of Ucalegon, which revives the earlier point about proximity to Greek names as an influence on textual corruption. One can only cautiously suggest that a tiny Greek suits the Juvenalian *Graeculus* motif rather well.

Martial's Cordus (he may allude to one or two characters) is a tempting argument for Juvenal's poet. But facile identification between the characters of Martial and Juvenal is hazardous. Martial ridicules the sartorial

[12] See also G. Highet, *op. cit.* 300.
[13] "Varia Juvenalia," *CR* 1 (1951) 138f.
[14] *Epigr.* 3.83.1.
[15] *Inst. Or.* 1.4.25.
[16] Griffith found one attestation in *CIL* 6.24572 (a servile or libertine name). Codrus does not appear in I. Kajanto's *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki 1965) at all.
[17] Kajanto, *op. cit.* 73, 75, 295.
[18] As suggested by Griffith to explain the Codrus in Vergil, *Ecl.* 5.11; 7.22, 26.

elegance of Cordus,[19] jests upon Cordus the gullible lover,[20] and answers the request of Cordus the critic for shorter epigrams with logical brevity.[21] Only this last allusion suggests a Cordus with literary interests. Demands for brevity come oddly from a writer of epic, unless he had a sly sense of humour. One might connect a love of brevity with the diminutive fellow of Juvenal 3.203, 208, but that is probably too frivolous.[22]

It required no great feat of imagination for the scholiast to identify the character at 1.2 as a *poeta vitiosus*. The allusions at 3.203, 208 are clearly sympathetic. Hence, there is no pressing need to harmonise the readings in the two poems.

3. Juvenal's Cluvienus: Friend or Foe?

Sat. 1.79-80: *si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*
qualemcumque potest, quales ego vel Cluvienus.

The scholiast took Cluvienus to be a *delerus poeta vel indoctus*. So does Highet,[23] who suggests that the name was a cover for some contemporary, inserted into the published version, whereas the real name will have been used at recitations.

I have argued elsewhere[24] against this view. Why on earth should Juvenal have been afraid of naming a poetaster? He is not usually so wary of this breed. And, if Highet is right, why was it any less dangerous to name names at recitations where *delatores* might be present to report back?

Highet hit on two of Martial's characters as possible metrical equations for Cluvienus: Decianus or Julius Cerealis. But there is little hint from Martial that Decianus was a poet.[25] Cerealis composed a Gigantomachy and some pastoral ditties;[26] he would be the better bet of the two.

But we may be wrong to infer that Cluvienus was a mediocre scribbler. The context allows the belief that the reference is a compliment to a fellow satirist. If so, cover names still confound the issue. Perhaps Cluvienus is the real name. It seems otherwise unattested, but that is no insuperable objection. There is some epigraphic attestation for *Cluvianus*,[27] and this is relevant for another reason. It would better fit the suggestion of L. A. MacKay[28] that the reference may allude to the Sam-

[19] *Epigr.* 2.57.4; the joke is repeated in 5.23 and 5.26.
[20] *Epigr.* 3.15.
[21] *Epigr.* 3.83.
[22] On the dangers of equating characters in the two poets, see the *caveat* of Friedlaender, *Essays on Juvenal* (tr. J. R. C. Martyn, Melbourne 1969) 63.
[23] *Op. cit.* 290-91.
[24] "Cover names and dead victims in Juvenal," *Athenaeum* 45 (1967) 304f.
[25] *Epigr.* 1.61.10; also in 1.8.4; 1.24.1; 1.39.8; *Praef.* to book 2; 2.5.1.
[26] *Epigr.* 11.52.17-18.
[27] See Kajanto, *op. cit.* 144.
[28] *CP* 53 (1958) 236f.

nite town of Cluviae. This was the birthplace of Helvidius Priscus.[29] The younger Priscus is reported by Suetonius[30] to have been executed by Domitian for ridiculing the emperor's divorce in his farcical *Paris and Oenone*. This would connect with the tradition that Juvenal incurred the wrath of Paris, who was involved in the fall of Domitia.

If MacKay is right, should we read *Cluvianus* for *Cluvienus*? The manuscripts may have the wrong form, though there seem to be no significant variants, and *Cluvienus* would be the *lectio difficilior*. *Cluvienus* might indicate that Juvenal was exercising some little caution, though this would have been superfluous after Domitian's death, and it would in any case have been a very transparent guise. Elsewhere,[31] Juvenal does name the elder Helvidius Priscus (along with Thrasea); it is hard to decide if this spoils the interpretation of MacKay.

One can only be subjective about literary matters. I now[32] think that the context of Juvenal's allusion does not call for a mocking anticlimactic reference to a bad poet. Cluvienus can be a sympathetic reference. If so, MacKay is probably right.[33] If one retains the traditional implication, we are probably left with a poetaster under his own name, rather than one thinly veiled under a cover.

[29]Tacitus *Hist.* 4.5.

[30]*Domitian* 10.4.

[31]*Sat.* 5.36.

[32]Thus modifying the view taken in my above-mentioned article.

[33]He is most recently supported by K. H. Waters, "Juvenal and the reign of Trajan," *Antichthon* 4 (1970) 62f. (see in particular p. 68, n. 23).

XXXVII

JUVENAL'S CRISPINUS

As is well known, Crispinus was the victim of some of Juvenal's choicest abuse in the First and Fourth Satires. In the standard commentaries and prosopographical registers, he is universally regarded as a *praefectus praetorio* under Domitian.[1] Since there is no other attestation for such a character, the equation has been something of a bother to historians. The present paper contends that there is not the slightest warrant for thinking that Crispinus was a prefect; further, that an analysis of what Juvenal actually says about him suggests that he was no more than a court buffoon.

The name Crispinus is unhelpfully common in all periods of Roman history. For Juvenal's own time, one notices (for easy instance) characters as diverse as the young son of Vettius Bolanus who was celebrated in a poem by Statius (*Silvae* 5.2), and C. Clodius Crispinus, *consul ordinarius* in 113.[2] Many Crispini feature in inscriptions, including (one may emphasise, in the present context) freedmen.[3]

Such frequency should make us wary of any glib equation of Juvenal's victim with the Crispinus mentioned in two epigrams of Martial (7.99; 8.48). In point of fact, it will be seen that there *are* solid grounds for the identification, but it does not in the least help to establish Crispinus as praetorian prefect.

---

1. This idea that Crispinus was *praefectus praetorio* is essentially that of B. Borghesi, *Oeuvres complètes* 5 (Paris, 1869), 513–6. It is perpetuated in the editions of Friedländer, Mayor (observe a discrepancy or error in his Index, p. 439, where Crispinus is billed as *praefectus urbi*), and Duff. Cf. also Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte* (Appendix 11, 'The friends and companions of the Emperor', in vol. 4, 69, of the English version by A. B. Gough, London, 1913); *PW* 4.1720–1; J. A. Crook, *Consilium Principis* (Cambridge, 1955), 50, 162. This consensus is reflected in Stein's entry in *PIR*^{2} C 1586: "praefectum praetorio eum fuisse putant viri docti" (without discussion). The Budé Juvenal of Labriolle-Villeneuve offers no comment on Crispinus; it translates the descriptive phrase *princeps equitum* (4.32) as "prince de nos chevaliers". The problem is ignored by W. C. Helmbold & N. E. O'Neil, 'The Structure of Juvenal 4', *AJP* 77 (1956), 68–73. Highet exhibits mild reservations ("it should be emphasised that there is little external evidence for his rank") in *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford, 1954), 260, but accepts the idea without qualification 28 pages later. O. Hirschfeld, *Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der römischen Verwaltungsgeschichte* 1 (Berlin, 1877), 223, regarded Crispinus as an imperial secretary, for which there is no warrant either. It will be seen later that Furneaux (*ad Ann.* 15.34.3) *may* have disagreed. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 636, doubted the equation, suggesting instead (albeit without any argumentation) that Crispinus may have been *praefectus annonae*. Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford, 1969), calls our man "a terrible informer", M. Durry, *Les Cohortes Prétoriennes* (Paris, 1968), 149, n. 1, comments (without amplification) that "il n'est pas certain toutefois que Crispinus ait été préfet." J. G. Griffith, 'Juvenal and the Flavian Establishment,' *GR* 16 (1969), 145–6, suggested that he might have been *praefectus Aegypti*. However, he is less easily fitted in than Griffith supposes; cf. O. W. Reinmuth, *A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt* (New Haven, 1967), 86–9. The only scholar to have seriously challenged Crispinus' claims to any official position is P. White, 'Ecce Iterum Crispinus,' *AJP* 95 (1974), 377–82.

2. There is also the suffect consul A. Caepio Crispinus from around the year 97, albeit his precise position in the *Fasti* is uncertain; cf. Syme, *Tacitus*, 642, n. 2.

3. For the details, see I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki, 1965), 223.

There is one certain case of a Crispinus who was a holder of this office in the first century A.D. That was Rufrius Crispinus, a man fated to be the first husband of Poppaea, who served under Claudius.[4] Gilbert Highet[5] was led by this to wonder whether Crispinus in Juvenal might not be a false name, one inspired by the earlier prefect.

That notion imports (alas!) the vexed business of cover-names.[6] It could be suggestive that Horace several times attacks a Crispinus in the *Sermones*;[7] there is also one in Persius (5.126). The name might be thought endemic to satirical poetry. However, the Horatian Crispinus at least would appear to have been a real person, and a live one at that.[8]

Moreover, the other eleven members of Domitian's cabinet on parade in Juvenal's Fourth Satire are readily identifiable as real people.[9] It is difficult to see why the poet should feel any need to conceal the actual name of just one of the twelve, especially one who seems in any case to be dead or disgraced by the time Juvenal came to publish the poem.[10]

Highet's idea also presupposes what has to be proved, namely that Juvenal's victim is a prefect concealed under the name of a predecessor in that office. It would be just as legitimate to see the satirist's target as a *delator* who is given the name of a notorious antecedent, namely Caepio Crispinus who was active under Tiberius.[11]

Crispinus is probably best regarded as the real name of a real person. Not that it was necessarily the victim's original appellation. Should anyone wonder how the *verna Canopi* came by his respectable nomenclature, it would be sufficient to recall that the assumption of Roman names was common practice with freedmen, and popular enough with *peregrini* to earn a legal restraint from the emperor Claudius.[12]

Juvenal introduces his victim thus:

> *cum pars Niliacae plebis, cum verna Canopi*
> *Crispinus Tyrias umero revocante lacernas*
> *ventilet aestivum digitis sudantibus aurum*
> *nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae,*
> *difficile est saturam non scribere.* (1.25–30)

4. Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.1.3; 11.4.5; 13.45.4.

5. *Op. cit.*, 260.

6. Cf. B. Baldwin, 'Cover-names and Dead Victims in Juvenal', *Athenaeum* 45 (1967), 304–12, with subsequent modifications in 'Three Characters in Juvenal', *CW* 66 (1972), 101–4.

7. *Serm.* 1.1.120; 1.3.139; 1.4.14; 2.7.45.

8. Cf. N. Rudd, 'The Names in Horace's *Satires*', *CQ* N.S. 10 (1960), 162.

9. Albeit there are differing identifications of Montanus and Pompeius; cf. Highet, 260–1; Crook, *op. cit.*, 50–1 (with his Prosopographical Index).

10. A necessary assumption, of course, if the last two lines of Satire One really mean that Juvenal did not attack living people (or, at least, not potent ones); cf. Friedländer, 'On the Personal Names in Juvenal', *op. cit.*, 318–21. The opening lines of the Fourth Satire seem to suggest that Crispinus' fate was an object lesson of sorts.

11. Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.74.

12. Suetonius, *Claudius* 25: *peregrinae condicionis homines vetuit usurpare Romana nomina dumtaxat gentilicia*; Friendländer, *op. cit.*, 56–7.

The racialist ranting needs little comment. It is thoroughly traditional and familiar. For the picture of a base foreigner conspicuously rich in Rome (or Italy), one easily adduces the Petronian Trimalchio. A better case, however, may be that of Claudius Etruscus' father, whose death prompted an epicedium from the ready pen of Statius (*Silvae* 3.3). This man rose to high office and favours under several emperors from servile origins in Smyrna. It is worth remarking that slurring references to a man's beginnings were not restricted to satirical abuse. Statius thought such words as

> *supplevit fortuna genus culpamque parentum*
> *occuluit.* (3.3.45–6)

appropriate to his effusion over the father of Claudius Etruscus!

A depraved Egyptian evokes no surprise. It need not be strictly true, however, that Crispinus derived from Canopus. The town was proverbial for its vices. Juvenal elsewhere (6.84; 15.46) employs it as a synonym for decadence. So do other Roman writers: Lucan, and Seneca, for easy instance.[13]. And Greek ones, also. Strabo (800a) talks of κανωβισμός, and it is worth remarking that Octavian is made to dub Antony a cymbal player from Canopus in a rhetorical confection of Cassius Dio (50.27.2).

The point is of some moment for those who favour the identification of Juvenal's Crispinus with the homonym in Martial. In one of his two relevant epigrams (7.99.2), the latter alludes to *tua Memphis.* Such a discrepancy need not rule out the identification. Indeed, the argument is reversible, for one could say "Your Memphis" to an Egyptian without implying that he actually came from there.

A good deal of ink has been spilled on the matter of Crispinus' ring. In essence, Housman had what ought to have been the last word.[14] Yet there may be one additional facet to the joke. Strictly speaking, Crispinus should have worn a gilded iron ring, since only equestrians of free birth were entitled to the pure gold one.[15] Juvenal may be saying that the languid Egyptian cannot abide the heavier ring appropriate to his station.

The company Crispinus keeps in Satire One is instructive. He is bracketed with an uxorious eunuch, a lady gladiator, a barber,[16] a fat lawyer, and an assortment of delators and gigolos. Social types, in other words, not men of high official position. There is no hint that Crispinus is anything more than an effeminate foreigner.

This characterisation continues in Satire Four. The essence of Crispinus is summed up in the phrase *aegrae solaque libidine fortes / deliciae* (3–4). He is also a *monstrum nulla virtute redemptum* (2). The language is strong, but not unparalleled, Later in the same poem, the blind delator Catullus Messallinus is

13. Lucan 2.542; 10.64; Seneca, *Ep.* 51.3.

14. Reviewing H. L. Wilson's edition of Juvenal in *CR* 17 (1903), 465–8 (= *Classical Papers*, 2, 614).

15. Cf. the valuable note on Petronius, *Satyricon* 32.3, in M. S. Smith's edition of the *Cena* (Oxford, 1975).

16. Unless one follows Knoche in deleting lines 24–5.

advertised as a *grande et conspicuum nostro quoque tempore monstrum* (115). It will be seen that this may well be significant.

The story of Crispinus and his fish occupies the first part of the poem. Apart from a further thrust at his Egyptian origins in line 24 (*succinctus patria quondam, Crispine, papyro*), there are no particular details of the rascal until we reach the climactic:

purpureus magni ructarit scurra Palati,
iam princeps equitum . . . (31–2)

A scholiast took *princeps equitum* to indicate that Crispinus was (in his words) *magister equitum.* Hence the modern identification. It is clear, however, that this is merely an inference from the present passage. The scholiasts had no independent knowledge of Crispinus. When he appears in Satire One, they call him a senator and an *amicus* of Domitian.

Still more to the point, *princeps equitum* does not connote the office of *praefectus praetorio.* It is a much more general term than that. A letter of the younger Pliny offers a telling demonstration. It describes a certain Minicius Macrinus thus: *equestris ordinis princeps, quia nihil altius voluit; adlectus enim a divo Vespasiano inter praetorios honestam quietem huic nostrae—ambitioni dicam an dignitati?—constantissime praetulit.*[17]

Mayor laid much stress on the description of Crispinus as *purpureus,* citing John Lydus[18] to the effect that a purple cloak was a badge of office for the praetorian prefect. This, in fact, clinches nothing, for a brace of reasons.

First, the purple is not restricted to one office. Valla, commenting on Juvenal 4.94, quotes the only four lines we possess of Statius' epic *De bello Germanico:*

lumina: Nestorei mitis prudentia Crispi
et Fabius Veiento–potentem signat utrumque
purpura, ter memores implerunt nomine fastos–
et prope Caesareae confinis Acilius aulae.

There are obvious reasons for thinking that Juvenal is parodying this in his register of Domitian's advisors. To the immediate point is this use of purple to designate power: neither Veiento nor Vibius Crispus was praetorian prefect.

17. *Ep.* 1.14.5, with Sherwin-White's note *ad locum.* In Cicero's day, the phrase *princeps equestris ordinis* (or *equitum Romanorum*) appears to have connoted the first *decurio* of the first *turma* of cavalry; see, e.g., Cicero, *Ad fam.* 11.16.2 (of his friend L. Aelius Lamia). For honorific extensions of the compliment, cf. *In Verr.* 1.53.139: *tantus in adulescente clarissimo ac principe iuventutis pudor fuit; Pro Rab.* 2.3: *C. Curtius princeps ordinis equestris fortissimus et maximus publicanus; Pro Sulla* 12.34: *cum princeps, cum auctor, cum signifer esset iuventutis; Ad fam.* 6.10.2: *cum omni gradu amplissimo dignissimus, tum certe ordinis tui facile princeps.* Cf. C. Nicolet, *L'ordre équestre* (Paris, 1974), 472; J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république* (Paris, 1963), 456. Needless to say, none of this has to do with praetorian prefects. Certainly, such a phrase can be used of a man who rose to this eminence, as is evidenced by Velleius' description of Sejanus as *principe equestris ordinis patre natum* (2.127.3). The point is, it does not have to connote a prefect, as the passage from Pliny shows. Juvenal is simply being sarcastic: Crispinus' talents as a *scurra* made him the most influential of the knights (see later in this article for the parallel cases of Paelignus and Vatinius). Juvenal's sequence, *ructarit scurra Palati / iam princeps equitum,* seems to me to reinforce this interpretation.

18. *De mag.* 2.13.2.

Secondly, this colour is not confined to men of rank. In Martial 8.48, someone has stolen Crispinus' *Tyria abolla.* This phrase at once reminds us of the *Tyrias lacernas* of Juvenal's victim, and makes an equation of the two characters tempting. But Mayor had no warrant for insisting that *abolla* must refer to military uniform. It is true that the *praefectus urbi* Pegasus has an *abolla* in Satire Four (76: *rapta properabat abolla*). However, the word can also denote the cloak of a philosopher, a meaning it must bear in Juvenal 3.115, where the crime of the *Stoicus delator* is described as *facinus maioris abollae.* Furthermore, Martial goes on to observe that not everyone is suited to the purple: *nec nisi deliciis convenit iste color* (8.48.6).

So Martial's Crispinus had a purple cloak that befitted a *deliciae.* The Crispinus of Juvenal has a Tyrian garment (1.27), is a *purpureus scurra*, and is stigmatised by the term *deliciae.* It may add up to an equation.

In Satire One, we observed the sort of company Crispinus kept. Likewise, in Domitian's cabinet he is coupled with the fat and sluggish Montanus, recurring only as a creature soaked in perfume: *et matutino sudans Crispinus amomo* (108). Again, no hint of any official position, in flagrant contrast to Pegasus, whose rank is clearly described, and Fuscus, identified as the praetorian prefect Cornelius Fuscus by the allusion to his fate in the Dacian war (111–2).

An imperial institution was the court jester, a person to mock and be mocked. Juvenal, in fact, found criticism of it a good way to open his Fifth Satire. Two outstanding examples in the pages of Tacitus[19] are Paelignus under Claudius and Vatinus under Nero. Both are classified as *scurrae*: Claudius was drawn to Paelignus because of his own familiarity, *conversatione scurrarum,* whilst Vatinius employed *facetiis scurrilibus.*

Also, both were deformed. Paelignus was *deridiculo corporis despiciendus*; Vatinius is described as a creature *corpore detorto.*[20] Now, as we have seen, the characteristic of Crispinus most harped on by Juvenal is his physical frailty: he cannot support a heavy ring, and is abused in the words *aegrae deliciae.* It is also notable that Juvenal calls him a *monstrum*, for the other employment of that noun in Satire Four is with reference to a physically deficient character, the blind delator.

Crispinus is clearly a figure of influence at the court of Domitian. Which is in tune with the aforementioned *scurrae.* Paelignus was *Claudio perquam familiaris*; Vatinius *eo usque valuit ut gratia pecunia vi nocendi etiam malos praemineret.*[21] Finally, these characters enjoyed a special licence to jest even at the

19. *Ann.* 12.49.1; 15.34.3. Furneaux's note on the latter passage adduces Crispinus, but does not indicate whether or not he accepted the *praefectus praetorio* identification.

20. Martial 14.96.2 also equips him with a long nose.

21. Cf. Tacitus, *Dial.* 11.2, for the *potentia* of Vatinius.

emperors. Vatinius may have been *primo in contumelias adsumptus*, but he went on to establish himself *optimi cuiusque criminatione*, and was always saying to Nero, "I hate you because you are a senator."[22] This quality may afford a link with the Crispinus of Martial 7.99, who is approached as a *candidus lector* with the power to influence Domitian's reading. That may well imply a degree of bullying persuasion, if we are to believe the claim of Suetonius (*Dom.* 20) that the last of the Flavians ignored history and poetry and read only the memoirs and transactions of Tiberius.

22. Dio Cassius 63.15.1.

XXXVIII

JUVENAL 1.155-7

pone Tigillinum, taeda lucebis in illa
qua stantes ardent qui fixo gutture fumant,
et latum media sulcum deducit harena.

A. A. Barrett's recent[1] addition of a *raeda* to Juvenal 1.155 is a novel and ingenious contribution to the ago-old debate over the text and meaning of the passage in question. His proposal is, however, vulnerable to the following objections.

First, it is worth emphasizing that there is no manuscript variant for the traditional reading *taeda*. In a passage so fraught with problems and textual discrepancies, this is probably suggestive. Furthermore, *taeda* was indisputably in the text of the scholiasts, since they comment on its meaning, albeit without any suggestion of an alternative reading.

Next, in the Zliten mosaic adduced by Barrett, the vehicle employed is clearly a two-wheeler. A *raeda*, by contrast, was always four-wheeled. It is so defined by Isidore of Seville:[2] 'reda: genus vehiculi quattuor rotarum'; also, a rescript in the Theodosian Code contrasts *raeda* with *birota*.[3]

Nor, apart from this, is the mosaic a cogent parallel. In an activity involving wild animals, the use of a cart with a long pole was surely to guarantee the arena attendants' own safety. This is clearly not a consideration with burning victims.

With regard to the meaning of *sulcum*, Barrett ignores all the evidence for the regular procedure of placing victims and their stakes in trenches. Aulus Gellius (*NA* 3.14.19) quotes Cato to the effect that the Carthaginians 'homines defoderunt in tarram dimidiatos ignemque circumposuerunt, ita interfecerunt'. Asinius Pollio, in a letter to Cicero (*Ad fam.* 10.32.3) reports the action of Balbus at Gades against the unfortunate Fadius: 'defodit in ludo et vivum combussit'. By Nero's time, this was the standard method, on the evidence of Seneca: 'circumdati defossis corporibus ignes' (*De ira* 3.3.6). Valla's scholiast was well aware of all this, as his explanation of *sulcum* shows: 'fossam in qua stipites figebant in quibus ardebant'. It was precisely this procedure that lent novelty to the fact or fiction produced by the *Historia Augusta*[4] in claiming that Avidius Cassius was the first man to erect a huge post and tie victims for burning onto it, from top to bottom.

It is legitimate to point out that it is only a presumption that Juvenal is thinking of the burning of Christians under Nero; Barrett's opening paragraph is unwarrantedly confident about this. Given the tone of his Satires as a whole, Juvenal does not strike one as being a man who would have had any more sympathy for Christians than Tacitus had. Nor does it make any obvious sense to say that the sect was punished for exposing Tigellinus. The scholiastic explanation, 'pone Tigellinum: hoc est in satura', seems a more likely one. We are thereby led to think of the episode reported by Suetonius, *Cal.* 27:

[1] *CQ* 27 (1977), 438–40.

[2] *Orig.* 20.12. My colleague, Dr. M. B. Walbank, warns me that Isidore can be very unreliable on technological matters. But surely anyone could distinguish a two-wheeler from a four-wheeler—it involves no more in modern terms than telling a car and a bicycle apart.

[3] *Cod. Theod.* 8.5.8.

[4] *AC* 4.2.

'atellanae poetam ob ambigui loci versiculum media amphitheatri arena igni cremavit'. Christians, after all, were not the only ones to be burned by imperial orders. In the context of Juvenal, it is relevant to adduce the claim of Pliny[1] that under Trajan, unlike Domitian, no one was now burned in the arena.

Yet even allowing that Christians are the inspiration for Juvenal's lines does not help Barrett's case. He takes no account of Tertullian's description (*Apol.* 50.3) of the burning of the martyrs: 'nunc sarmenticios et semaxios appelletis quia ad stipitem dimidii axis revincti sarmentorum ambitu exurimur'.

True, this is not an easy sentence to translate with total confidence, in that *semaxius* is an epithet unique to this passage,[2] and there are two nouns *axis*, one meaning wheel, the other plank. However, the *TLL* applies the latter sense to Tertullian's account, and *dimidii* ought to mean 'half-way down in the ground', because the aforementioned description of burning by Cato is quoted by Gellius specifically to illustrate this meaning for *dimidiatos*.[3] All of this seems to me to prove that Juvenal's victims were tied to stakes in a line, with the stakes buried half-way into a trench for the sake of stability, in the regular way.

With respect to other supposed problems in the lines, Barrett is needlessly troubled by the change of tense from *lucebis* to *deducit*. Friedländer long ago demonstrated that such an enallage temporum, especially the present with the future, is quite usual in Juvenal and other authors. As to the alleged difficulty of finding a subject for *deducit*, I personally am quite convinced by Giangrande's[4] argument that it is Tigellinus himself. This affords perfect sense, and there is no problem with the word order, since Tigellinus is given the emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence. There is an exact parallel, as Giangrande noted, in the famous *expende Hannibalem* sequence in the Tenth Satire: here Hannibal, so introduced in 1.147, is undeniably the subject of *diducit* in 1.153.

No real problems, then, and no cause or justification for altering *taeda* to *raeda*. For those still bothered by the traditional difficulties, there remains the explanation of *sulcum* as referring to a furrow or beam of light. There is much more to recommend this than Barrett's cavalier dismissal of it as a 'curious notion'[5] would suggest. A furrow of light is a regular turn of phrase in epic, traceable at least as far back as Apollonius of Rhodes (4.294–7). It was popular with Neronian and Flavian poets—a point of some relevance to Juvenal—as is evidenced by Lucan (5.561–3; 10.502) and Valerius Flaccus (1.568–9).

Most striking of all is Virgil, *Aen.* 2.697–8: 'tum longo limite sulcus/dat lucem et late circum loca sulphure fumant'. Consider the verbal parallels between this and the Juvenalian sequence: *late/latum*; *sulphure fumant/ gutture*—or *pectore* -*fumant*. One might be led to conclude that Juvenal is deliberately echoing a Virgilian original. Given this, the conjecture *dant lucis* for *deducit* would gain strength from Virgil's *dat lucem*.[6]

[1] *Pan.* 33.3: 'nemo e spectatore spectaculum factus miseras voluptates unco et ignibus expiavit'.

[2] Dictionaries variously register it thus or as *semiaxius* or *semiaxiarius*.

[3] This entire notice of Gellius is consecrated to the real and alleged distinctions of meaning between *dimidius* and *dimidiatus*; it is clear from Gellius and Varro that Romans used both words with some indifference.

[4] 'Juvenalian Emendations and Interpretations', *Eranos* 63 (1965), 33–5.

[5] Referring to S. G. Owen's note on the passage in *CR* 11 (1897), 400–1.

[6] Owen attributes the conjecture to Dobree, although the latter actually says he had it from *adulescens quidam* (very like Aulus Gellius, that!). Owen went on to conjecture and print *dent lucis* in his

O.C.T. With *taeda* as the subject (cf. Madvig and Mayor on this), *dat lucis* would also be possible. Notice, finally, that retention of *deducit arena* does not dilute the Virgilian flavour, since the phrase occurs in *Georg.* 1.114.

• One afterthought: Lucretius 3.1017 enumerates the standard punishments thus: 'verbera carnifices robur pix lammina taedae'; this might enhance the claims of *taeda* in the Juvenal passage.

XXXIX

TURNUS THE SATIRIST

A mere two lines (badly corrupted) survive of this man's work; we owe their preservation to a scholiast on Juvenal 1.71. In Morel (*FPL* 134), they appear thus:

ex quo Caesareas suboles Lucusta cecidit
horrida cura sui † verna nota Neronis

Inevitably, there has been a good deal of extravagant rewriting. Casaubon devised *ex quo Caesareas soboles homicida Locusta | occidit curaeque veneni admota Neroni est,* which was printed (without comment) by Mayor. Bardon came up with *ex quo Caesareas soboles horrenda Locusta | occidit, fit cura sui pernota Neronis.* Morel ignored all rewritings up to his time, acknowledging only Leo's suggestion of *nota virtute Neronis* for the obelised part of the second line.[1]

Two preliminary observations. First, it may not be necessary to keep close to the corrupt text in the last part of the second verse. *Verna nota Neronis* has all the appearance of a scribe's explanation of who Locusta was; it would be an apt enough one. The gloss may have completely ousted the original words of the line in question.

Secondly, there is no absolute guarantee that the second line was a hexameter. True, Turnus produced satirical verses which were commended by Martial. Yet nothing completely forbids the notion that he penned witty elegiac couplets in the manner of the Spanish poet. It is worth noting in this regard that he is bracketed by Sidonius Apollinaris (9.266–7) with Memor (his own brother, a tragedian), Ennius, Catullus, Petronius, Stella, and Martial himself. This is emphatically not a gallery of satirists or hexameter poets.[2]

[1] In the manuscripts PS (for details, see Wessner's edition), the verses appear as *ex qua Caesareas soboles horrida Locusta occidit cura sui verna nota Neronis.* Morel's version of the first line is that of Jahn, Leo, and Baehrens; it is also printed without comment in the notice of Turnus in *PW* (Zweite Reihe) VII A, 1413–4, by Eva Frank. Cf. H. Bardon, *La Littérature Latine Inconnue* 2 (Paris, 1956) 225–6.

[2] We know from Martial 4.6.4 that Stella wrote elegiacs, other allusions to Stella (in Martial and Statius) are conveniently assembled in Teuffel-Schwabe 2, 322.1.

For all that, it remains very likely that Turnus did write satires in the conventional form. Granted this, the words in question do form the second half of a hexameter line. What remedies are feasible? Leo's suggestion was very reasonable, giving a neat enough flourish of sarcasm. Those who wish to cling to the words at issue may find the diminutive *vernacula* a useful expedient. Remembering how Locusta earned her rewards and reputation, *verna* might conceal some case of the noun *venenum*, or a cognate. One recalls that the lady is ushered into the narrative of Tacitus with the phrase *nuper damnata veneficii* (*Ann.* 12.66). Perhaps Turnus wrote something along these lines?

There is not too much point in troubling the world at length with one's private fancies. Yet one further speculation may be ventured. It is quite obvious that more than the obelised words are corrupt. Could *sui* be an error for *suis* (the genitive of *sus*)? Suetonius (*Nero* 33) describes how Locusta experimented on a pig in order to produce a brew suitable for the liquidation of Britannicus.[3] Turnus could conceivably be alluding to that tale in the verses under discussion. The notion would have the further advantage of imparting some extra, paronomasic effect to the epithet *horrida*.

What of Turnus himself? Outside the scholiast's allusions, he is attested by Martial who (7.97.7–8) puts himself second only *Turni nobilibus libellis*, and who (11.10) commends Turnus for applying his *ingentia pectora* to satire. Assuming that *frater* in the second line of this latter couplet is to be taken literally, Turnus was the brother of Memor the tragedian. This gives us the interesting case of a pair of literary brothers.

After Martial, Turnus (like Juvenal) is long forgotten until exhumed by late antiquity. Apart from the aforementioned passage of Sidonius, Turnus is invoked as a practitioner of fierce satire by Rutilius Namatianus (1.603 f.), and by John Lydus (*De mag.* 1.41).

Both couple him with Juvenal. The collocation is clearly standard.[4] Whether Turnus deserved to be in such illustrious company, we of course cannot say. Juvenal may very well have been influenced by his immediate predecessor, especially if he knew him through the recommendations of Martial;[5] and also if Turnus had been reckoned as one recipient of Quintilian's compliment to satirists who *sunt clari hodieque et qui olim nominabuntur* (10.1.95).

It is worth remarking that Juvenal's line on Locusta occurs less than ten lines before the *ex quo Deucalion* sequence. Could this be because he was

[3] It should be observed that the biographer's word is *porcellus*; he never uses the noun *sus*.

[4] It might be noticed that Lydus adds Petronius to his reference, employing the sequence Turnus, Juvenal, Petronius: some might be tempted to use this as an argument for the later dating of the author of the *Satyricon*.

[5] That is, assuming we are right in equating the Juvenalis of Martial 7.24, 7.91, and 12.18 with the satirist.

under the influence of Turnus' *ex quo Caesareas . . .*? Given the predilection of Juvenal for sequences beginning *ex quo*, that does not have to be the case.[6] It is nonetheless, arguable that the scholiast was prompted to his allusion by making this very connection.

This notion would gain some extra currency if one could accept the statement contained in Valla's scholiast on Juvenal 1.20 to the effect that the *magnus Auruncae alumnus* adduced by Juvenal is not Lucilius, as is naturally and commonly supposed, but Turnus, who also derived from that town. The scholiast ascribes this theory to Probus. It has been accepted by Bardon and the *PW* notice without question.

It is an attractive idea, to some extent. However, when viewed coolly, three factors may weaken it. First, it is hard to believe that Juvenal is not making the obvious reference to Lucilius. It was standard practice to adduce the latter as a model; both Horace and Persius do this. Next, the scholiast, still allegedly echoing Probus, further asks us to believe that two other obscure and dubious poets, Lenaeus and Silius, also hail from the same town. It is not easy to credit this trinity of Auruncan satirists. Finally, the scholiast (as quoted below) claims that Turnus himself was *libertini generis:* given his prejudices, it is hardly feasible that Juvenal would import a freedman as a commendable model.

According to Valla's scholiast on Juvenal 1.20, Turnus was *libertini generis ad honores ambitione provectus est, potens in aula Vespasianorum Titi et Domitiani.* If true, this would shed some light on two matters of consequence. First, Turnus can be seen to attack dead victims in the manner commonly ascribed to Juvenal.[7] Even if his lines were penned at the outset of Titus' reign, they would still be assaulting someone dead for ten years.[8]

Second, the spectacle of a satirist *potens* at the court of Domitian does something to qualify the standard portrait of the last of the Flavians. There is no hint of Turnus in the extant narratives of Tacitus, or in the correspondence of Pliny. Nor does he feature in the more balanced account of Suetonius; indeed, by emphasizing the doom of the younger Helvidius incurred by the imprudent satire of his *Oenone* (*Dom.* 10.4), the biographer emphasizes the picture of an emperor intolerant of freedom of expression.

To be sure, Turnus may fairly be suspected of having been, to some extent, the "house satirist". For all that, evocation of Locusta had an element of daring. Her name conjured memories of the fatal last supper of

[6] See Juvenal 6.294; 10.77; 14.261.

[7] On which, see G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford, 1954) 56–7; B. Baldwin, "Cover names and Dead Victims in Juvenal", *Athenaeum* 45 (1967) 304–12; K. H. Waters, "Juvenal and the Reign of Trajan", *Antichthon* 4 (1970) 62–77 (cf. especially 68).

[8] According to Dio Cassius (64.3.4), Locusta was executed by Galba.

Claudius. On which matter, Domitian was sensitive; he was ridiculed by his father for refusing to eat mushrooms at dinner (Suetonius, *Dom.* 14.1). In general terms, the presence of a satirist at the court of Domitian may help to justify the modern attempts to provide a more balanced view of that emperor.[9]

[9] The phenomenon of Turnus was missed by K. H. Waters in his invaluable article "The Character of Domitian", *Phoenix* 18 (1964) 49–77; nor is Turnus mentioned anywhere in Syme's *Tacitus*, though he would have been relevant to the brief discussion of satire at pp. 499–500.

TACITUS

XL

EXECUTIONS, TRIALS, AND PUNISHMENT IN THE REIGN OF NERO

The purpose of this paper is to throw light on the administration of justice during the reign of Nero, by studying in some detail the individual cases concerned. This is not to be an exercise in whitewashing or blackwashing Nero; rather I seek to establish the individual motives and influences surrounding the various trials and prosecutions, and to indicate some possible patterns. Less formal attention will be paid to the events consequent upon the conspiracy of Piso, since these have been adequately detailed in recent years.[1] I shall, however, contend that the Tacitean picture of a ' reign of terror ' is exaggerated, and at times refuted by his own narrative. Episodes from the earlier years of the reign seems to warrant more attention, especially if this period includes the so-called *Quinquennium Neronis* lauded by Trajan.[2] I am, in fact, attempting to put the reign of Nero in the sort of perspective that has been established for Tiberius[3] and Domitian[4] by other scholars. It has seemed best to

[1] B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus* (Manchester, 1952) pp. 131-137; R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), *passim*. One might refer also to the highly coloured pages of B. W. Henderson, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero* (London, 1903), pp. 257-302. The episode is dealt with in some detail by J. H. Bishop, *Nero: The Man and the Legend* (London, 1964), pp. 90-113.

[2] The exact meaning of this encomium, which derives from Victor, *De Caes.* 5.2, is still debated. The early, middle, and late periods of the reign have all been proposed. See Syme, op. cit., p. 262 n. 6, for a conspectus of opinions. [3] R. S. Rogers, *Criminal Trials under Tiberius* (Middletown, 1935); Walker, op. cit., pp. 263-270. [4] K. H. Waters, *The Character of Domitian*, « Phoenix », 18.1, 1964, pp. 49 ff.

assemble my evidences and arguments in the form of a commentary on the relevant portions of the *Annals*, supplementing these by the minor evidence supplied by Suetonius and Dio.

The reign was ushered in by the murder of M. Junius Silanus, proconsul of Asia. Tacitus' descriptive language recalls the ominous commencement of the reign of Tiberius with the death of Postumus Agrippa.[5] Both Tacitus and Dio[6] regard Agrippina as the instigatrix of his destruction. This Silanus was a curious figure. He is alleged to have been of sluggish temperament, an object of scorn to emperors in general and dubbed 'the golden sheep' by Caligula. Yet he was consul in 46, and now the governor of Asia. Above all, he was an *abnepos* of Augustus. This relationship, along with her fears that he might be contemplating revenge for his brother L. Silanus, one of her illustrious victims under Claudius, is given by Tacitus as Agrippina's motive for his murder. Tacitus is explicit in his claim that Nero was ignorant of her designs. This may be true, but the consequences of Silanus' death are curious, if so. Silanus was blatantly poisoned[7] in Asia by Publius Celer and Helius; Dio adds the piquant touch that she supplied some of the poison used for disposing of Claudius! Celer and Helius are described, by Tacitus, as 'rei familiari principis in Asia impositi'. This proves nothing, since Agrippina could have tampered with such men without the knowledge of Nero. But both of these men appear later as standing in Nero's favour. Helius was the freedman who acted on Nero's behalf in Rome, during the emperor's concert tour of Greece. Celer was an *eques*, impeached in 57 for extortion in Asia. Nero was unable to save Celer, but managed to protract the case until Celer died of old age; Tacitus suggests that Celer's murder of Silanus was so notorious that it overshadowed his other crimes[8]. Now obviously Nero could have learned of Celer's complicity in his mother's plot since 54. Why did he apparently wish to shield Celer, and why was he unable to procure his acquittal? If Nero had been ignorant

[5] *Ann.* XIII 1: 'prima novo principatu mors Junii Silani...'; cp. *Ann.* I 6,1: 'primum facinus novi principatus fuit Postumi Agrippae caedes'.
[6] Dio, LXI 6.4-5. [7] *Ann.* XIII 1: 'venenum inter epulas datum est apertius quam ut fallerent'. [8] *Ann.* XIII 33: 'nam Celer interfecto, ut memoravi, Silano pro consule magnitudine sceleris cetera flagitia obtegebat'.

of the plot to murder Silanus, and disapproved of the deed in retrospect, why was Celer not used as a weapon against Agrippina in 57? Why was Helius retained and elevated, instead of being liquidated? It would seem likely that Nero at least approved the *fait accompli* of Silanus' murder. It might be mentioned at this juncture that the circumstances of Silanus' death, poison being administered to him at dinner, are strikingly similar to those surrounding the poisoning of Britannicus[9]. Agrippina was notoriously familiar with poisons, and the spectre of Locusta may loom here, but one is tempted to wonder about Nero's alleged ignorance of the deed. After all, he was surely aware of the popular talk, retailed by Tacitus, that the family, maturity, and good qualities of Silanus rendered the latter a more suitable choice for emperor than himself.[10]

Suspicion may grow when we consider the careers and fates of the various Silani, during the Julio-Claudian period. It is not always easy to disentangle the individual Silani, as Dio found.[11] An earlier M. Junius Silanus, suffect consul in 15 and father-in-law of Caligula, had been driven to suicide by that emperor.[12] The episode was of interest to Tacitus, since Agricola's father had lost his life for refusing to prosecute Silanus, on the orders of Caligula.[14] Our Silanus seems to have been lucky to escape from Caligula with nothing worse than the 'golden sheep' sobriquet. The M. Junius Silanus who had been consul in 19 married Aemilia Lepida, a match of political consequence.[13] The fate of L. Junius Silanus, praetor in 48 and betrothed to Octavia for a time, was one of the scandals of the age.[15] C. Appius Junius Silanus (consul in 28) had been a victim of Messallina, an episode included in the *Ludus* ascribed to Seneca.[16] Relevant also, at this juncture, is the unsuccessful attempt

[9] The poisoning of Britannicus at dinner is described in *Ann.* XIII 16.

[10] *Ann.* XIII 1: 'crebra vulgi fama anteponendum esse vixdum pueritiam egresso Neroni et imperium per scelus adepto virum aetate composita, insontem, nobilem et, quod tunc spectaretur, e Caesarum posteris'. The language here is evocative, as Furneaux noted (*ad locum*); Claudius is described as being 'aetate composita' in *Ann.* VI 46.

[11] Dio confuses the victim of Agrippina with the earlier M. Silanus who had been suffect consul in 15. See Syme, p. 388 n. 5.

[12] Suetonius, *Gaius* 23.

[13] *Agricola* 4. See Anderson, ad locum.

[14] On this see Syme, p. 385 n. 6.

[15] See my article *Executions under Claudius: Seneca's Ludus De Morte Claudii*, « Phoenix », 18. 1, 1964, pp. 39 ff.

[16] See

by Junia Silana to prosecute Agrippina in 55, on the notable charge of inciting Rubellius Plautus to revolution.[17] Finally, the case of L. Junius Silanus Torquatus. He had the dangerous quality of relationship to Augustus; despite which, his career was varied and prosperous.[18] He was feared by Piso as a possible rival to succeed Nero;[19] in the aftermath of the exposing of Piso's conspiracy, Silanus was implicated in the downfall of his intimate, C. Cassius Longinus, exiled, and quickly done to death.[20] His uncle, the distinguished D. Junius Silanus Torquatus, consul in 53, had recently been accused of plotting revolution, and had committed suicide to avoid conviction.[21]

Silani, then, rise and fall almost monotonously in the period, notably under Caligula, Claudius, and Nero. Their personal merits exacerbate the suspicions of emperors and, in the case of Piso, conspirators alike. To a degree, it may be necessary to condemn the regime for persecuting the name. It does not seem surprising that Nero's reign begins with the murder of Silanus. Apart from the personal motive of Agrippina, the memory of the Silanus who died on the very day of her marriage to Claudius is adducible as a factor. Tacitus is not distorting his facts or our impressions in his carefully evocative description; however, as we have argued, Nero's ignorance of his mother's deed may not have been so complete as the historian maintains.

Narcissus falls victim to Agrippina about the same time; so Tacitus and Dio, despite the confusion in the latter.[22] Tacitus devotes little space to his demise, alleging that Nero regretted the loss of one with his vices. The freedman was an obvious candidate for Agrip-

Baldwin, art. cit., for reasons for denying the ascription of this pamplet to Seneca. [17] *Ann.* XIII 19. [18] An inscription (see Furneaux, *ad Ann.* XV 52) mentions his various civic and religious posts. [19] *Ann.* XV 52: 'timore occulto ne L. Silanus nobilitate disciplinaque C. Cassii, apud quem educatus erat, ad omnem claritudinem sublatus imperium invaderet, prompte daturis qui a coniuratione integri essent quique miserarentur Neronem tanquam per scelus interfectum.' [20] *Ann.* XVI 7-9. [21] *Ann.* XV 35; Dio. LXII 27.2. [22] Dio narrates the death of Narcisus in LXI 34, 4-6. However, in LXIII 3,4, Narcissus is included in a list of 'scum that had floated to the surface in Nero's reign', and is said to have been executed by Galba, along with Helius, Locusta, and others. Perhaps another Narcissus is meant? The freedman of Claudius can obviously not be described as coming to the surface in Nero's reign.

pina's hate, thanks tho his sponsorship of Aelia Paetina's claims to succeed Messallina. Nervertheless, we might speculate a little beyond the brevity and malice of Tacitus. Dio has the tantalising story that Narcissus was in possession of secret documents from Claudius' archives; these included information hostile 'to Agrippina and others'. He destroyed these before his death. The identity of these other people is unfathomable. But there is one rising star closely linked with Narcissus and the mother of Nero. This is Vespasian. His excellent career under Claudius, embracing military commands in Germany and Britain, triumphal regalia, two priesthoods and two months of consular authority, is said by Suetonius[23] to have been obtained through the favour of Narcissus. Then, until his governorship in Africa some ten years after his consular spell, he is said to have lived in retirement, through fear of Agrippina who hated all clients of Narcissus. Since his fears outlived Agrippina herself, and in view of his dangerous lack of appreciation for Nero's vocalisings, we can possibly add substance to Tacitus' account. The patent hostility to Narcissus on the part of the author of the *Ludus*[24] further underlines the political issues at stake in Narcissus' downfall. For Vespasian, apart from his indifference to the arts, was an intimate of Thrasea and Soranus,[25] a fact difficult to conceal after the latters' impeachments.

Further schemes of Agrippina were frustrated by Burrus and Seneca. Her influence begins to decline. But there is an enigmatic incident, the last recorded by Tacitus for 54. An equestrian, Julius Densus, was accused with favouring Britannicus; the charge was dismissed, apparently through Nero's intervention.[26] Was this an attempted maiestas prosecution? If so, who brought the charge (or rather instigated it?), and why did it fail? This obscure incident is a preamble to Agrippina's vain espousing of Britannicus, and the latter's murder (an episode, as we have seen, hideously reminiscent of the poisoning of Silanus).

55 was a dramatic year, apart from the death of Britannicus.

[23] *Vespasian* 4. [24] Baldwin, art. cit., p. 44. [25] Tacitus, *Hist.* IV. 7: 'fuisse Vespasiano amicitiam cum Thrasea, Sorano, Sentio'. [26] *Ann.* XIII 10: 'neque recepti sunt inter reos Carrinas Celer senator servo accusante aut Julius Densus equester, cui favor in Britannicum crimini dabatur'. Furneaux (*ad locum*) thinks this was an attempt to revive *maiestas* trials.

A pleasant note was struck by the emperor's restoring of Plautius Lateranus to the senate; he had been expelled for adultery with Messallina. Ironic; for, as consul designate, he became involved with Piso, and paid for this with his life, earning accolades from Tacitus for his patriotism and courage[27]. Then came the demoting of Pallas, to the alarm of Agrippina. This led her to an unsavoury outpouring of her emotions, in the course of which she actually invoked the shades of the Silani![28] This looks desperate. But, after Britannicus removal, she was still influential enough to survive the charges laid by Junia Silana. The enigma in this, and related episodes, is Burrus; this remarkable person is very hard to align in the intrigues of the court, and deserves some detailed consideration.

Burrus is something of a hero to Tacitus. He is commended for his military reputation and his personal austerity;[29] his obituary notice is brief, but laudatory, his virtues contrasted with the vices of his two successors.[30] Unfortunately, his complicated relationship with Agrippina, as it appears in the Tacitean narrative, takes the gloss off this pleasant picture.[31]

A Narbonensian from the town of Vasio,[32] Burrus served as a military tribune, and as a procurator to Livia, Tiberius, and Claudius.[33] It will not be too cynical to see some signs of competence in political intrigue in this sorth of career. In 51, he was elevated to the prefecture by Agrippina.[34] He replaced Rufrius Crispinus and Lucius Geta, men regarded by Agrippina as dangerously loyal to the memory and children of Messallina. He repaid his patroness well in

[27] His motive for joining Piso was 'amor rei publicae' (*Ann.* XV. 49); he died 'plenus constantis silentii' (*Ann.* XV. 60). [28] *Ann.* XIII 14: 'simul intendere manus, adgerere probra, consecratum Claudium, infernos Silanorum manis invocare et tot inrita facinora'. [29] He is spoken of as being 'egregiae militaris famae' in 51 (*Ann.* XII 42); he is distinguished 'severitate morum' in 54 (*Ann.* XIII 2). [30] *Ann.* XIV 51: 'civitati grande desiderium eius mansit per memoriam virtutis et successorum alterius segnem innocentiam, alterius flagrantissima flagitia'. [31] According to Syme, op. cit., p. 610 n. 2, the Tacitean picture of the virtuous Burrus has been doubted by H. de la Ville de Mirmont, « Rev. Phil. », XXXIV, 1910, pp. 73 ff.; I regret that this article is not available to me at the time of writing. [32] On the importance of Vasio, see Syme, pp. 622-623. [33] The evidence for this is inscriptional. See Furneaux, *ad Ann.* XII 42, also Syme, pp. 590-591. [34] *Ann.* XII 42.

assisting the succession of Nero. But in the earliest stages of the new regime he is aligned, with Seneca, against the royal mother. No reason is offered by Tacitus, except the two men's loathing of her ferocity.[35] Seneca also, of course, owed a personal debt to Agrippina; she had procured his recall from exile.

A simple case of virtue against vice? Perhaps. But Seneca can rarely be classified with such facility.[36] And Burrus soon demonstrates his own gifts for intrigue. Upon the accusations against Agrippina laid by Junia Silana, mentioned earlier, Nero's first reaction was to kill his mother and Rubellius Plautus, and to remove Burrus from office. This seems a remarkable reaction. Why is Nero fearful of Burrus? The prefect is supposed to be at one with Seneca against his mother. A little earlier in the narrative, Tacitus has her railing against the domination of the crippled Burrus with his maimed hand and the former exile Seneca with his glib tongue.[37] Tacitus represents Nero as recalling Burrus' debt to Agrippina. But could he have been ignorant of the apparent breach between her and her two former clients? Tacitus himself admits the dilemma. He cites the claim of Fabius Rusticus that the emperor went so far as to draft a letter to a certain Caecina Tuscus,[38] giving him Burrus' position; Seneca interceded for Burrus and quashed this move. Against this, Tacitus prefers the version of Cluvius Rufus and Pliny; they record that Burrus' loyalty was never in question. Tacitus hints that Fabius' version is coloured by his favourable attitude to Seneca.

This difficulty is compounded. Burrus now emerges as the voice

[35] *Ann.* XIII 2: 'certamen utrique unum erat contra ferociam Agrippinae'.

[36] I have no space to go into the vexed question of Seneca's character. For the respective attitudes of Tacitus and Dio see Syme, pp. 550-551. I should perhaps state my opinion that the harsher remarks of Dio have some foundation. The role of Seneca in the murder of Agrippina, as described by Tacitus, shows what he was capable of, however deserving of death Agrippina was.

[37] *Ann.* XIII 14: 'debilis rursus Burrus et exul Seneca, trunca scilicet manu et professoria lingua generis humani regimen expostulantes'.

[38] This man was the son of Nero's nurse (Suetonius, *Nero* 35) and later prefect of Egypt. Late in Nero's reign he was banished for using a bath that had been prepared for the emperor (Dio, LXIII 18; Suetonius, loc. cit.). He is soon back in Rome, in 69, giving a dinner party that was to assist in the downfall of Junius Blaesus (Tacitus, *Hist.* III 38).

of moderation. He insists that Agrippina be given a chance to defend herself; if guilty, she shall die. Burrus, in the presence of Seneca, acquaints Agrippina with the charges. Her defence was convincing, and the accusers were routed. In sinister tones Tacitus records that Rubellius Plautus was left unharmed, for the moment;[39] in 60, Nero requested his withdrawal to Asia, to quiet popular interpretation of a comet's advent as presaging Plautus' imperial succession. Then, in 62, after the death of Burrus, Plautus is one of the two most notable and immediate victims of Tigellinus.[40]

Why does Burrus miss this chance of disposing of Agrippina? Why, for that matter, does Seneca? Restrained by their personal ties with her? Or held back by feelings of simple humanity? Not impossible, but both did not scruple to connive at the squalid removal of Agrippina in 59. On this occasion Burrus is despicable; he would not commit the deed himself, or depute his praetorians. Instead, he invited Anicetus to accomplish the murder, without protest.[41] Seneca earned public obloquy by composing Nero's notorius speech of self-exculpation.

The immediate aftermath to the failure of Silana's attempt is just as strange. Burrus and Pallas were charged, by a notorius figure named Paetus, with plotting to elevate Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix to the throne. Sulla had been consul in 52, and was married to Antonia, daughter of Claudius. He has a poor press from Tacitus,[42] but was much distrusted by Nero. He was exiled to Massilia in 58, and murdered, along with Rubellius Plautus in 62. This link in destiny seems more than coincidence. The coupling of Burrus with Pallas, a man of diminished status, but an old intimate of Agrippina, is indicative of something afoot. Both were cleared of the charge. Not surprising in the case of Burrus, since he was allowed to assist in his own prosecution as a judge! Pallas survived a little longer than Burrus, in the long run.[43]

[39] *Ann.* XIII 22: 'Plautus ad praesens silentio transmissus est'. [40] *Ann.* XIV 57 ff. [41] *Ann.* XIV 7. [42] He is described as 'socors ingenium' and 'nullius ausi capax' in *Ann.* XIII 47. [43] Pallas was thought to have been poisoned, along with Doryphorus, in 62 (*Ann.* XIV 65; Suetonius, *Nero* 35). Tacitus records the poisoning as a rumour, Suetonius as a fact. Dio (LXII 14) says that Nero got rid of Pallas, but does not give any details.

Burrus has the air of a confirmed intriguer. We shall not waste time over his alleged poisoning by Nero.[44] In 55, I suspect that he was far more than the simple, virtuous figure pictured by Tacitus. The concept of a complete cleavage between himself and Agrippina is hard to maintain. He was fishing in troubled waters, and is trying to play off Nero's apprehensions against Agrippina's intrigues. He can have inspired no great trust in anyone. He was waiting upon events, but also utilising opportunities to dictate the course of these events. Until his death he, and Rubellius and Sulla, were rightly suspected by Nero. After the death of Agrippina, his position was great but equivocal. In this, he may have profited from the lesson of Seneca. His death allowed Nero to take the chance offered by Tigellinus of disposing of Plautus and Sulla. This marks the end of a faction. Burrus was mourned, rightly perhaps, in view of the excesses of Tigellinus. But the contrast drawn by Tacitus between his virtue and the evil of his successors is largely illusory. Nor, as we shall see, did his death, and the eclipse of Seneca, usher in an immediate bloodbath. The narrative of Tacitus belies his own impression of a terror.

The next two years were relatively quiet. The Julius Montanus affair tarnished Nero's nocturnal entertainments,[45] but had no political significance or consequence. Tacitus has to pay a lukewarm tribute to the still reasonable atmosphere in Rome.[46] The affairs of the provinces receive attention. A governor of Sardinia was condemned, another official survived an extortion charge brought by the Cretans. The only two deaths recorded by Tacitus were suicide and natural causes.[47] The following year saw Nero as one of the consul. This prompts Tacitus to dismiss the year as of little consequence.[48] An unfair verdict. It conceals the restoration to rank of the ex-consul Lurius Varus, and several important financial and legislative measures.[49] There were prosecutions. Most important of these, in view

[44] *Ann.* XIV 51: 'incertum valetudine an veneno'. Both Suetonius and Dio accept the poisoning as a fact, without argument. [45] *Ann.* XIII 25. The incident is famous, and needs no comment. [46] *Ann.* XIII 28: 'manebat nihilo minus quaedam imago rei publicae'. [47] Caninius Rebilus and L. Volusius Saturninus. [48] *Ann.* XIII 31: 'pauca memoria digna evenere'. [49] The urban mob received a largess; the treasury was given forty million sesterces 'ad

of his past notoriety, was that of Publius Celer. This has already been discussed at some length. Two unpleasant figure of the period were indicted by provincials. Cossutianus Capito was condemned, Eprius Marcellus acquitted and successful in counter-charges against his accurses.

External matters occupied much of 58; Nero is again consul. The major domestic event was the prosecution of P. Suillius Rufus, with Seneca involved as the prime mover of the attack. I have discussed this case in detail elsewhere.[50] Poppaea enters the scene, to the pleasure of Nero and the discomfort of Otho. After narrating this affair, Tacitus draws a conclusion: Nero now ceased to look for excuses to cover his crimes.[51] The comment has little merit, when one recalls the forthcoming apologetics for the murder of Agrippina. The distortion is used as a preamble to the exiling of Sulla. Tacitus needs the device; he does not believe the charge that Sulla had plotted to kill Nero, but his grounds for disbelief are no credit to the accused, as we have seen. The domestic events for 58 are rounded off by Nero's acquittal of two ex-governors of Africa, accused of extortion.

Apart from the death of Agrippina, which requires no detailing, 59 was another quiet year. Cyrene brought in two accusations against provincial officials; one succeeded, the other failed. Nor did the next year, with Nero in a fourth consulship, show anything remarkable, apart from the tactful withdrawal of Rubellius Plautus; a relief to Nero, and probably to Burrus. There was one successful prosecution for extortion.[52] Otherwise the year was taken up with Eastern affairs, and with artistic activities at Rome.

Passing over 61,[53] we reach the key year of 62. It is notable

retinendam populi fidem'; the purchase tax on slaves was waived (though Tacitus regards this as a spurious achievement); Capua and Nuceria received some veterans; provincial officials were deprived of the right to present gladiatorial or beast shows in their provinces. These are all solid achievements which Tacitus has to record, despite his initial comment. [50] Baldwin, art. cit., pp. 46-48. [51] *Ann.* XIII 47: 'Hactenus Nero flagitiis et sceleribus velamenta quaesivit'. [52] The guilty party was the equestrian Vibius Secundus (*Ann.* XIV 28). [53] British affairs are crucial in this year. At Rome, the murder of the city prefect, by one of his own slaves, was the most noteworthy event. The decease of Memmius Regulus also occurred. Tarquitius Priscus was con-

that Nero does not hold a consulship. Apart from the death of Burrus, we have: the deaths of Rubellius Plautus and Sulla, the divorce and death of Octavia, the elevation of Tigellinus, the eclipse of Seneca, and the restoration of *maiestas* trials. It is this last, and most ominous, event which demands attention.

It was a remarkable business. The defendant was the praetor Antistius Sosianus, a figure odious to Tacitus, and rightly so. In 56, as a tribune of the people, Antistius clashed with the praetor Vibullius on a minor administrative matter, and was overruled and censured by the Senate for his action.[54] His offence in 62 was to compose some scurrilous verses against Nero, and ventilate them at a dinner party hosted by M. Ostorius Scapula. The host had a distinguished name, and had been a suffect consul in 59. Antistius, who was exiled as a results of this trial, took revenge in 66 by denouncing Scapula and procuring his death.[55] Clearly, Antistius saw Scapula as at least partly responsible for his exposure.[56] In 70, Antistius was sent back into exile; Tacitus records this with very stern comments on the character of the man.[57]

Such a record precludes our sympathy for Antistius. His accuser was an even more notorius character of the period, Cossutianus Capito. We have already seen him condemned for extortion, but he was infamous before that.[58] Now, thanks to his influential relative Tigellinus, he is in the Senate. Later, he makes his mark as one of the accurses of Thrasea, a double irony.[59] Antistius was condemned and exiled on the proposal of Thrasea; he thus escaped the attempt to

demned for extortion; this was a popular verdict, since he had once accused his senior in Africa, Statilius Taurus, at the behest of Agrippina, and had been expelled from the Senate for his pains (*Ann.* XII 59). [54] *Ann.* XIII 28. Antistius had released some rabble who had been causing trouble over pantomime artists. [55] *Ann.* XVI 14-16. His charges were trumped-up ones, involving the astrological interests of Scapula and P. Anteius. [56] Though Tacitus (*Ann.* XIV 48) records that Scapula testified in favour of Antistius. [57] *Hist.* IV 44: 'Sosianus pravitate morum multis exitiosus'. [58] He is coupled with the infamous *Suillius* (*Ann.* XI 6). [59] Thrasea, despite his more lenient proposal of punishment for Antistius, is here on the same side as Cossutianus. The spectacle of Thrasea assisting the impeachment of a satirist is disquieting to his admirers.

have him executed. Nero confirmed the lighter sentence, though allegedly with reluctance.

The essential point is: why was *maiestas* revived for this particular affair? Antistius was a deserving victim, no doubt, but hardly an important one. *Maiestas* would have been less surprisingly introduced in earlier years against such luminaries as Rubellius Plautus and Sulla. Tacitus felt the difficulty, but his explanation is amazing. The intention was not to destroy Antistius but to give the emperor a chance to demonstrate his clemency by vetoing the capital verdict of the Senate.[60] But, although Thrasea had mitigated the penalty, Nero merely acquiesced in the decision, adding only that, although Antistius deserved worse, the Senate could safely have acquitted him.

Before further comment, the next alleged victim of the regime should be introduced. The unsavoury and persistent Fabricius Veiento was exiled for his satirical squibs against senators and priests.[61] The additional charge that he had trafficked in offices prompted Nero to intervene and procure his exile, and the destruction of his writings.

Both Antistius and Fabricius are represented by Tacitus as the first two victims of the new evil of the reign. Both come to grief because of their satirical activities. Yet, according to Suetonius,[62] Nero was astonishingly lenient with personal abuse of himself; in fact, he once intervened to shield some graffiti composers from severe punishment. Yet Veiento's efforts were not even directed against the emperor.

These two cases are magnified out of all proportion by Tacitus, as is the role of Nero in them. The historian's motive is clear. He continues, after the Fabricius case, by observing, by way of introducing the death of Burrus: 'sed gravescentibus in dies publicis malis'. This is a flagrant and inept distortion. His first two cases were ill-chosen, as proof of the new and evil turn in the reign. Nor is the aftermath a period of bloodshed. The tragedy of Octavia, indeed, cannot be palliated. But the deaths of Burrus, Pallas, and Doryphorus

[60] *Ann.* XIV 48: 'tum primum revocata ea lex; credebaturque haud perinde exitium Antistio quam imperatori gloriam quaeri, ut condemnatum a senatu intercessione tribunicia morti eximeret'. [61] On his career see Syme, pp. 4-5. [62] *Nero* 39.

(all allegedly poisoned) can only be given an open verdict. Seneca could still rebut charges concerning his association with Piso.[63] The year 63 is untainted by murder or *maiestas*. Despite the eminence of Tigellinus and Poppaea, the consuls were the younger Memmius Regulus and Verginius Rufus. That the latter could rise so high at this time is something of an embarrassment to Tacitus.[64] And the following year, though marked by the fire at Rome and the Christian issue, sees only the suicide of Silanus Torquatus.

The conspiracy of Piso. I shall not spend time on the narrative of this celebrated affair; details are very familiar. It is of some interest to observe the lesser authorities' accounts. Dio does not even mention Piso, but ascribes the plot to Seneca and Rufus.[65] Suetonius regards Piso as the leading figure, but dismissed the episode in a sentence or so.[66] The highly coloured language of Tacitus cannot be reconciled with his own narrative. Henderson computed the number of victims of Nero's punishments as thirty-six in all; of these, only one really innocent figure meets his death.[67] So much for Tacitus' 'continua et vincta agmina' of accused.[68] His picture of a Rome choked by funerals[69] is equally fictitious. A 'column' of exiles turns out to be no more than five in number.[70] It must never be forgotten that Tacitus has no doubts about the guilt of the bulk of the conspirators, nor does he have much sympathy for the ringleaders.[71] Two

[63] *Ann.* XIV 65. He was secretly denounced by a certain Romanus, but the latter was hoist with his own petard. [64] Tacitus delivered his funeral *laudatio* (Pliny, *Ep.* II 1). [65] LXII 24. [66] *Nero* 36. [67] Henderson, op. cit., p. 486, tabulates the results of the conspiracy. The innocent victim is the consul Vestinus, who perished without charge or accuser (*Ann.* XV 68-69). Seneca is fairly classified as being of uncertain guilt. Of the guilty who paid with their lives, five are listed as senators, five as equites, five as soldiers. In addition, there was the woman Epicharis. The equites Antonius Natalis and Cervarius Proculus were pardoned for their timely denunciations of fellow conspirators. One soldier was pardoned, one acquitted; both committed suicide. Of the innocent: twelve senators, and the wife of Scaevinus, were exiled. Four soldiers were deprived of rank. Lucan's mother was not punished, though Tacitus claims she was also 'sine absolutione'. [68] *Ann.* XV 58. [69] *Ann.* XV 71: 'Sed compleri interim urbs funeribus.' [70] *Ibid.*: The five men are inflated to the status of 'velut in agmen.' [71] *Ann.* XV 48-49. Piso, for instance, is described as follows: 'procul gravitas morum aut voluptatum parsimonia; levitati ac magnificentiae et aliquando luxu indulgebat', etc. Apart

exceptions to this rule reveal the bias of Tacitus' account. Plautius Lateranus is commended for his patriotism, as we saw earlier. Yet he owed a genuine personal debt to Nero. Faenius Rufus is said to be the 'summum robur' of the conspiracy, a man 'vita famaque laudatum'. All very well, until we recall that he has been previously cast as one of 'segnem innocentiam', by contrast to Burrus! And this same Faenius showed himself to be the least worthy of men (with the exception of Lucan), when the plot was exposed. We may also be a little less reluctant than Tacitus in our thanks to Nero for sparing the wife of Seneca and the mother of Lucan. Finally, Tacitus himself is constrained to point out that, contrary to popular charges that Nero was fabricating an excuse to murder innocent people, out of fear and jealousy, the plot is abundantly testified to by contemporary accounts and the evidence of exiles who returned after 68 to Rome.[72]

Remaining events in 65 included the death of Poppaea, which has no political meaning. There was the Cassius Longinus and L. Silanus affair, which has been discussed previously. A triple suicide saw the end of L. Antistius Vetus and family, relatives of Rubellius Plautus.[73] An equestrian friend of Vetus, one Publius Gallus, was exiled. In 66, apart from the return of Antistius Sosianus and its consequences, we have the deaths of Annaeus Mela (brother of Seneca), Anicius Cerealis, Rufrius Crispinus, and the colourful Petronius. Apart from the latter, these victims are dubious characters. Tacitus is suspicious of Mela's wealth, acquired as an imperial agent. Cerealis had once betrayed a plot to Caligula. Crispinus is the prefect replaced by Burrus in 51. He had arrested Asiaticus, in Claudius' reign, and had also been married to Poppaea.[74] In 66, before the *Annals* break off, we see the great prosecutions of Thrasea and Barea Soranus.

from Lateranus, the other conspirators are generally dubbed as men with grudges (such as Lucan and Afranius Quintianus) or hopes of self-advancement.

[72] *Ann.* XV 73: 'ceterum coeptam adultamque et revictam coniurationem neque tunc dubitavere quibus verum noscendi cura erat, et fatentur qui post interitum Neronis in urbem regressi sunt'. After which statement, Tacitus goes on to record the Senate's frustrating of the delation aimed against Seneca's brother, Junius Gallio. The episode rather spoils the Tacitean picture! [73] *Ann.* XVI 10. [74] The child of Crispinus and Poppaea was drowned, by order of Nero, according to Suetonius, *Nero* 35.

This is too familiar to detail. However, even here Tacitus must be read with caution; for, as Syme points out,[75] Soranus was not quite a paragon. Back in 52, as consul-designate, he had proposed the celebrated, and infamous, decree which gave Pallas an honorary praetorship and a huge sum of money.[76]

In conclusion. There was no sustained terror under Nero. *Maiestas* trials were not indiscriminately employed. After their revival, there is a long period virtually untainted by any bloodshed. The majority of the deaths and suicides after the Piso plot involved the guilty. The first victims of *maiestas* trials were themselves thoroughly deserving of punishment. We do not accuse Tacitus of fabrication. But his language is frequently at odds with his own narrative. His characterisations are distorted in emphasis (Faenius Rufus and Soranus being prime examples); his picture of Burrus seems the least trustworthy of all. Burrus was a schemer and not at all scrupulous, especially in his relationship with Agrippina. Justice is administered throughout the reign with a good deal of integrity. Extortion cases are always hard to assess, but the balance of convictions and acquittals is fairly even, and quite plausible. Certain individuals received benefits they hardly deserved (Lateranus possibly; certainly Cossutianus Capito and Eprius Marcellus). The most obvious victims of the regime are the various Silani. It has not been the aim of this paper to exculpate Nero from all responsibility for seeming crimes and perversions of justice. Indeed, we have occasionally added to his charge sheet, against Tacitus. But the Tacitean gallery of good men and bad will not do. Personal relationships and family politics are the key to the understanding of the early Principate; in this respect the basic element of Roman Republican politics continues after the establishment of autocracy. This is concealed in the design of Tacitus' *Annals*, but his own narrative provides the key to a more balanced view of the record and personal limitations of the Principate of Nero.

[75] P. 544. [76] *Ann.* XII 53.

XLI

THEMES, PERSONALITIES, AND DISTORTIONS IN TACITUS

Sciant, quibus moris est inlicita mirari, posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse. A convenient formula for explaining away the acquiescence of the historian and his father-in-law under Domitian. In later years, the need for apologies lapsed. The exordium to the *Histories* parades an unblushing admission of advancement under Domitian [1], and a reference to praetorship and quindecimvirate status under that emperor is obtruded into the *Annals* [2].

The *Agricola* was composed and published in 97-8. There were skeletons in many cupboards. Take the case of Verginius Rufus. At the age of eighty-three, he was brought out of retirement to usher in the year of 97 as colleague to Nerva. Why the old man was politically resuscitated is unclear. It was his third consulship; a relatively rare honour though one conferred upon individuals so diverse as Julius Frontinus, Vestricius Spurinna, and the controversial Fabricius Veiento [3]. Whatever Nerva's motive, the reappearance of Verginius was approved by Pliny and Tacitus. How many remembered that his first consulship had been in 63, in the year subsequent upon the death of Burrus, the alleged eclipse of Seneca, and the revival of *maiestas* trials? He was closely identified with the reign of Nero; not only because of his suppression of Vindex. Galba did not trust him, and he was not slow to support Otho from whom he received a second consulship. Verginius was equally quick to ingratiate himself with Vitellius [4].

---

[1] *Hist.* 1.1: *dignitatem nostram a Vespasiano inchoatam, a Tito auctam, a Domitiano longius provectam non abnuerim.*

[2] *Ann.* 11.11: *nam is quoque edidit ludos saeculares iisque intentius adfui sacerdotio quindecimvirali praeditus ac tuno praetor; quod non iactantia refero sed quia collegio quindecimvirum antiquitus ea cura et magistratus potissimum exequebantur officia caerimoniarum.*

[3] PLIN., *Ep.* 2.1.2., describes the tenure of three consulships as *summum fastigium privati hominis.* See A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (1966), 143.

[4] *Hist.* 1.77: 2.49, 51, 68. See SHERWIN-WHITE, 142-3.

It was not surprising that he was ostentatiously neglected by the Flavians. A partisan of Otho and Vitellius was not likely to be treated with enthusiasm by Vespasian, who could never have forgotten that Verginius might have been his emperor. Nor were the two celebrated refusals of power any guarantee that the ambiguous general would always be prepared to say no to future offers.

Verginius Rufus had a handy knack of accommodating himself to writers as well as emperors. Cluvius Rufus had felt it expedient to ask his pardon in advance for any uncongenial comments in his histories. Verginius gave the right answer: he had acted that men might be free to express the truth (5). Pliny extolled his merits, though not without a hint of exculpation for his survival (6). The consul Tacitus delivered his *laudatio*. Was the task chosen, or requested? Pliny thought the speech a good job well done; we can trust the author of the *Panegyricus* to recognise an efficient eulogy. He says nothing precise about its contents. Given the date and the situation, it may have been the genesis of some of the more question-begging aphorisms shortly to appear in the *Agricola*.

Julius Frontinus is lavishly praised by Pliny (7). He is also one of the few men to receive a compliment in the *Agricola*: *vir magnus quantum licebat* (8). The qualification is striking, though not unique. A similar phrase is used of the colourful Memmius Regulus under Nero (9). Frontinus is, at first blush, exemplary. His career was not tainted by advancement from Nero; like Tacitus, he began to rise under Vespasian, and his virtues received due acknowledgement from Nerva and Trajan. Unlike the historian, he seems to have been neglected by Domitian (10). In 98, Frontinus enjoyed the accolade of holding a consulship with Trajan. A third consulship followed in 100. He was a useful man to be on terms

---

(5) Plin., *Ep.* 9. 19. 5: see R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 179.

(6) *Ep.* 2, 1. 3: *Caesares quibus suspectus atque etiam invisus virtutibus fuerat evasit.* How?

(7) *Ep.* 4. 8. 3; 5. 1. 5.

(8) *Agr.* 17. 3.

(9) *Ann.* 14. 47: *auctoritate constantia fama, in quantum praeumbrante imperatoris fastigio datur, clarus.*

(10) See Sherwin-White, 273.

with, and the compliment in the *Agricola* may have been as judicious as it was deserved.

Silius Italicus posed more of a problem. People recalled that he had been the last consul appointed under Nero. Silius know more about politics than poetry. Along with Cluvius Rufus, he had attended the negotiations between Vitellius and Flavius Sabinus ([11]). His death, by self-starvation in his seventies, removed one of the last embarrassing links with the reign of Nero. Silius had incurred the stigma of a *delator,* a blot he subsequently erased *laudabili otio* ([12]).

Memories of eminence under Nero haunted no less a personage than Nerva. Whereas Vespasian had slumbered through the imperial poetry recitals, Nerva had been saluted as a connoisseur of erotic verses by Nero ([13]). An unforgettable compliment from that emperor; one wonders how Lucan and Petronius reacted. In 65, following the detection and suppression of Piso's conspiracy, Nero singled out three men for *triumphale decus*: Tigellinus, Petronius Turpilianus, and Cocceius Nerva ([14]). Reward for Tigellinus were predicable, and Petronius was a consular, but what had Nerva (then praetor designate) done to merit them? Along with the praetorian prefect, he had the supplemental honour of triumphal statues in the forum and effigies on the Palatine. And, whereas Galba executed Petronius and Tigellinus was constrained to suicide by Otho, Nerva survived. In 90, he shared a consulship with Domitian; the emperor did not partner the most interesting consul of the following year: M. Ulpius Traianus. Men indeed can be great even under bad emperors!

For Agricola too, the shadows of dubious preferment stretched back to the last of the Julio-Claudians. His first mentors were enough to turn a young man's head: Suetonius Paulinus and Salvius Titianus. From the former, in Britain, he acquired his *prima castrorum rudimenta* ([15]). It is notable that Agricola is not mentioned in Annals 14, when the relevant events are again described in detail. In Asia, Agricola's achievement was to resist

---

([11]) *Hist.* 3. 65.
([12]) Plin., *Ep.* 3. 7. 3.
([13]) Martial. 8. 70. 7; see Syme, 1 ff.
([14]) *Ann.* 15. 72.
([15]) *Agr.* 5. 2.

the opportunities for corruption provided by his superior, Salvius Titianus. Titianus was the brother of Otho, for whose cause Suetonius was to fight in 69.

Intimacy with Othonians was not the way to Nero's heart. Agricola was discreet. He also prospered. Tribunate and praetorship followed, the latter office in 68. Agricola submerged himself in *quies, otium*, and *silentium* (16). These virtues were a notable contrast to those of his contemporary, Arulenus Junius Rusticus, who as tribune in 66 tried to come to the aid of Thrasea (17).

The historian refines his formula to justify his father-in-law's youthful caution: *gnarus sub Nerone temporum, quibus inertia pro sapientia fuit. Sapientia* clearly alludes to the less pliable philosophers; the passage prepares for the later contrast between the *moderatio* and *prudentia* of Agricola and the *inani iactatione libertatis* of certain Stoics (18).

Agricola had no monopoly on *quies*. The exercise of that virtue saved Memmius Regulus from the consequences of Nero's designation of him as a fit candidate for the throne (19). A man who had been consul in 31, and a husband of Lollia Paulina, had perhaps earned the right to a little repose. But what was *otium* in one person was *segnitia* in another. Indeed, the same individual can be blamed and extolled for the identical qualities, in different contexts. Faenius Rufus is promoted from *segnem innocentiam* to *vita famaque laudatum* (20). *Segni otio* is held against Petronius Turpilianus, twice denounced for his conciliatory policies in Britain (21). Petronius was more energetic in other spheres. Having shared the glories of Tigellinus and Nerva in 65, he succumbed, along with Cingonius Varro, to Galba's *iter cruentum*: the two perished *tanquam innocentes* (22). It is clear why Petronius' British

(16) *Agr.* 6. 3.

(17) *Ann.* 16. 26. 4: *flagrans iuvenis, et cupidine laudis offerebat se intercessurum senatus consulto.* Thrasea was perhaps still jealous of his own *gloria.*

(18) *Agr.* 42. 4.

(19) *Ann.* 14. 47.

(20) *Ann.* 14, 51. 4; 15. 50. 4.

(21) *Agr.* 16. 3; *Ann.* 14, 39, 5.

(22) *Hist.* 1. 6.

policies had to be so unfairly denounced. He replaced Śuetonius Paulinus, that *diligenti ac moderato duci,* whom Agricola admired so much.

Tigellinus is represented as warning Nero that Rubellius Plautus was dangerous *adsumpta etiam Stoicorum adrogantia sectaque quae turbidos et negotiorum adpetentis faciat* (23). The sinister prefect was for once expressing a respectable sentiment. Tacitus exhibits little sympathy for philosophers. His distaste had been conditioned by Agricola, who was fond of recalling that he was deterred from philosophic enthusiasms that went *ultra quam concessum Romano ac senatori* by a prudent mother (24). It is piquant to observe that this *mater rarae castitatis* was anticipating the advice tendered to the young Nero by Agrippina (25); also that the upright Agricola was in some accord with Trimalchio, who boasted of his scorn of *philosophi* (26). One doubts that Agricola was in much danger of being seduced back into speculation by his military mentors. Paulinus, Titianus, Vettius Bolanus, Petilius Cerealis, and Vespasian were not noted for their abstract enthusiasms. Thrasea and Barea Soranus epitomised *virtus* (27). But Thrasea was tempted by *gloria,* and was willing to assist the impeachment of a satirist (28). And what had Soranus been about in 52, when as consul designate he proposed an infamous decree in honour of Pallas (29)? A certain class of philosopher is up braided for the hypocritical assumption of *ore vultuque tristi* at Nero's banquets, and malicious delight at the squabbles of such intellectuals was perhaps the one thing Nero and Tacitus had in common (30). Yet the historian will, as always, have it both ways. He laments that it became hazardous to praise Thrasea and Helvidius Priscus, and the expulsion of philosophers was a shocking proof of Domitian's tyranny (31).

---

(23) *Ann.* 14. 57. 5.
(24) *Agr.* 4. 4.
(25) Suet., *Nero* 52.
(26) Petron., *Sat.* 71.
(27) *Ann.* 16. 21.
(28) *Ann.* 14. 48-9.
(29) *Ann.* 12. 53. 2.
(30) *Ann.* 14. 16. 3.
(31) *Agr.* 2. 2.

Freedom of thought and expression is conventionally praised as a boon restored by Nerva and Trajan ([32]), and anger is professed at Tiberius, Nero, and Domitian for the suppression of literature. But Tacitus' moral indignation was selective. The first two victims of *maiestas* trials under Nero were both aspirant satirists: Antistius Sosianus and Fabricius Veiento ([33]). Antistius was a figure odious to Tacitus. His tribunate in 56 had been a rowdy affair, quite unlike the Agricolan *quies*. A clash with the praetor Vibullius and censure from the senate resulted from his release of some immoderate partisans of pantomime stars. Tacitus recounts the episode as illustration of his admission that *manebat nihilo minus quaedam imago rei publicae* ([34]). In 62, he recurs as praetor, and is in worse trouble. He composed lampoons against Nero, indiscreetly recited at a dinner party. His host, the younger Ostorius Scapula, vainly tried to shield Antistius against the incriminations of Cossutianus Capito. This latter was an extremely shady character; he had been coupled in infamy with Suillius, condemned for extortion, and was related to Tigellinus ([35]).

A peculiar and proleptic episode. Antistius was exiled on the motion of Thrasea, whose *libertas* is praised with reservation: he was partly motivated by desire for *gloria*. Tacitus cannot or will not explain why *maiestas* was revived for use against such a minor rascal as Antistius. He asserts that the whole affair was a farce. Nero wanted a chance to display clemency by using his tribunician authority to rescue the defendant from a capital sentence imposed by the senate. An unlikely story. The devious mask of Tiberius does not fit Nero, who had, at any rate, displayed his clemency in the previous year in the matter of Pedanius Secundus' murder ([36]). Moreover, Nero was thick skinned towards personal insults, and it is improbable that he would have used this issue as an excuse for reviving treason trials. It is more than a coincidence that the event comes just before the death of Burrus and the ascendancy of Tigellinus. If it was a put-up job, Cossutianus

---

([32]) *Agr.* 3; *Hist.* 1.1.
([33]) *Ann.* 14.48-50.
([34]) *Ann.* 13.28.
([35]) *Ann.* 11.6.5; 13.33.3; 14.48.2; 16.17.6.
([36]) *Ann.* 14.45.4.

was the agent of his relative, not of the emperor. Significantly, Cossutianus recurs later as one of the accusers of Thrasea ([37]). Antistius was persistent. He returned from exile, and denounced the hapless Ostorius Scapula ([38]). In 70, he was sent back into exile along with another formerly troublesome tribune, Octavius Sagitta ([39]. The pair were chosen as scapegoats for Nero's reign by Mucianus; Tacitus was approving ([40]).

The second victim of the revived treason trials was to become a by-word for prudent villainy: Fabricius Veiento ([41]). His offence was to ridicule senators and priests in pasquinades published under the title of *codicilli* ([42]). One would have thought that Nero would find such squibs congenial. The prosecution seems to have feared as much, since a supplemental charge of trafficking in office was hastily added by Tullius Geminus ([43]). It was the latter charge that brought Nero into the case. Veiento was banished, and his poems enjoyed the lustre of suppression ([44]).

Veiento returned, to hold three consulships under the Flavians. He was still going strong under Nerva, to the disgust of Pliny ([45]). Juvenal attacked him as a prominent delator of Domitian's reign, coupling him (as does Pliny) with Catullus Messalinus ([46]). Tacitus, however, avoids the collocation in the *Agricola* ([47]). Juvenal's word for Veiento is *prudens,* a virtue shared with Agricola. Nerva and Veiento had many, and perhaps dubious, memories to share.

How was influence at court won and lost? Individual ascent and eclipse was often far less momentous than Tacitus implies. *Annals* 14 opens with Poppaea nagging Nero to get rid of his

---

([37]) *Ann.* 16. 17. 6.

([38]) *Ann.* 16. 14.

([39]) *Hist.* 4. 44. For Octavius Sagitta see *Ann.* 13. 44.

([40]) *Sosianus pravitate morum multis exitiosus.*

([41]) Assuming his name is correctly restored for the MS *vegento.*

([42]) Compare *Ann.* 16. 19. 5, where Petronius satirises Nero's sexual activities in the *codicilli* of his will.

([43]) *Ann.* 14. 50; Tullius is restored for the MS *Talius.*

([44]) Though *mox licentia habendi oblivionem attulit.*

([45]) *Ep.* 4. 22. 4.

([46]) 4. 113; see also 3. 185, where Veiento is the archetypal *delator.* For doubts about this see Sherwin-White, 300.

([47]) Perhaps Tacitus was deterred from naming Veiento because of the latter's intimacy with Nerva.

mother. Near the end of the same book, some years later, the imperial and imperious mistress is still nagging, this time for the liquidation of Octavia. An old instrument was brought out: Anicetus, prefect of the fleet at Misenum in 59 and, like Seneca, a *pueritiae Neronis educator* (48). This worthy had not gained much from his inefficient removal of Agrippina, but was languishing between crimes. Personal domination over Nero was difficult to attain. Nor was the fall of an eminence immediately postluded by a purge of supporters. Pallas was left alive until 62, and his death was as questionable as that of Burrus (49). And who replaced Burrus? Faenius Rufus and Ofonius Tigellinus, both linked with Agrippina. Faenius had owed his successful tenure of the *praefectura annonae* to the late dowager, and Tigellinus had been banished by Gaius for his share in her personal favours (50).

Tacitus distorts by sweeping and inaccurate generalisations. *Gravescentibus in dies publicis malis* is the preface to Burrus' demise. But poison could not be proved in his case any more than in that of Agricola, *maiestas* trials did not immediately proliferate, and one of the consuls for the subsequent year was the excellent Verginius Rufus. Burrus' death signalled the eclipse of Seneca. He responded to the flurry of insinuations against his *potentia* by making a grand gesture of renunciation of the bulk of his wordly goods and retiring in a flood of postures (51). However, the *deteriores* who were intriguing against him are balanced by *prodentibus iis quibus aliqua honesti cura*. And, although he was allegedly *perculso*, Seneca recurs triumphantly rebutting the charges of a certain Romanus of undue familiarity with Piso (52). In fact, nothing happened to Seneca after his interview with Nero, save that he retired into the image of a valetudiarian philosopher.

The times were supposedly alien to men of virtue, and yet virtue did not consist of denouncing the times. Ideological pratings over *libertas* were idle or worse. Was any collective civilian

---

(48) *Ann.* 14. 3. 5.

(49) *Ann.* 14. 65; the freedman Doryphorus expired at the same time. Tacitus gets the best of both worlds by cautiously recording such rumours.

(50) Dio. 59. 23. 9.

(51) *Ann.* 14. 53-6.

(52) *Ann.* 14. 65; see my article on Seneca's potentia in *CP* 65 (1970), 187-8.

opposition to a bad *princeps* possible? And, if it was, was it also laudable? The senate was not invariably craven. A majority of its members risked the wrath of Nero by supporting Thrasea in the case of Antistius. What is more, they persisted in the face of a letter from the emperor which was tinged *offensione manifesta*. There were those who took their stand in the hope that they were *numero tuti*. Tacitus does not sneer. Indeed, his sarcasm is reserved for Aulus Vitellius, who took the minority position (53).

The historian's attitude contrasts with his views on popular tumults. His loudest laments over senatorial subservience are evoked by the execution of Octavia. Reasonably enough; but there had been popular demonstrations for her. These are shrugged off with the comment that it is safer for the rabble to protest because *ex mediocritate fortunae pauciora pericula sunt* (54). In other words, *numero tuti*.

The mob had also turned out to protest against the execution of the slaves of Pedanius Secundus. Tacitus does not care to explain why the urban populace should suddenly develop a concern for slaves. An explanation could have been found in the character of Pedanius, or his office (55). In the senate, not all supported the punitive speech of Cassius, but no individual dared to speak formally against the motion for mass execution. It remained for Nero to take a middle course. He rebuked the mob, but disallowed the motion of Cingonius Varro to extend the punishment to the victim's *liberti*. And thereby ignored an easy opportunity to curry favour with the mob. Naturally, he receives no plaudits from Tacitus.

The incident refutes Juvenal's claim that the populace was stirred only by bread and circuses, even if riots in Italy were relatively uncommon, except when food was short or passions high in a provincial theatre (56). Petronius observed that the people were *domi leones, fori vulpes* (57). For Tacitus, it was admirable when a crowd showed collective sentiment for the house of Ger-

---

(53) *Ann.* 14.49: *paucis exceptis, in quibus adulatione promptissimus fuit A. Vitellius.*

(54) *Ann.* 14.60.5; see Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (1969), 29 ff.

(55) See *Ann.* 6.10.5: for the unpopularity of the office.

(56) See Yavetz 9-37, 103 ff., for examples.

(57) *Sat.* 44.

manicus. More so, when *vox populi* was heard in support of an Agricola. Otherwise, its passions were trivial and its favour was to be feared or scorned.

Techniques vary as occasion demands. Even good *liberti* are admitted when they can be detected speaking for Agricola (58). When a year was quiet, or threatened to reveal virtue in a regime, it is discreetly tucked away. Thus, 57 is dismissed as a season in which *pauca memoria digna evenere* (59). When an illustrious individual is executed, his character is subtly altered to heighten the effect and the context of his death suppressed. Thus, the inopportunely named Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix is conjured up along with the more impressive Rubellius Plautus as a victim of the new influence of Tigellinus. He is put forward as *inopem et simulatorem segnitiae* (60). Nothing is recalled of his eminence under Claudius, his strange connection with Burrus and Pallas, and the fact that Nero had suspected him as long ago as 58 (61). That Sulla should perish in the same year as Burrus and Pallas attains a certain inevitability. According to Tacitus, Tigellinus claimed to Nero that the name of Sulla was one to conjure with in the Gallic provinces. After a century and a half? Nor is the audience reminded that Rubellius Plautus had been involved in accusations laid against Agrippina in 55; even Burrus had been implicated in that odd business (62).

One implicit distortion is not altogether Tacitus' fault. We do not know how he treated the conventionally « good » emperors. It can be inferred that he did not reckon Augustus in their register. The historian has his cake and eats it greedily. The memory of Divus Augustus was sanctified. Therefore, by opening the *Annals* in 14, and by stating that he will have little to say about the first *princeps*, the degeneration of his successors is heightened. Yet Augustus is frequently alluded to, and care is quickly taken to show that not all revered his name (63). Vespasian

---

(58) *Agr.* 41. 4: *optimus quisque libertorum amore et fide, pessimi malignitate et livore pronum deterioribus principem extimulabant.*

(59) *Ann.* 13. 31.

(60) *Ann.* 14. 57. 4.

(61) *Ann.* 12. 52; 13. 23. 47.

(62) *Ann.* 13. 19. 2 ff. See my discussion of the role of Burrus in *Parola del Passato* 117 (1967), 425 ff.

(63) *Ann.* 1. 10.

earned a generous compliment : *solusque omnium ante se principum in melius mutatus est* (64). Was that view maintained through the *Histories*? He was good to Agricola, who had been quick to follow his cause, and had set Tacitus' own career in motion. Hence neutral or favourable references in the *Agricola* and *Dialogus* (65). But an emperor commonly began well. By careful isolation of passages, the picture of Tiberius could also be made to appear more favourable.

Tacitus reserved the reigns of Nerva and Trajan for his old age. Anticipation of a pleasant task, or simple caution? The two paragons lack biographies in both Suetonius and the *Historia Augusta*. What does that *lacuna* signify? Perhaps nothing. But the careers of both, especially Nerva, under earlier emperors needed a talented apologist. Like Augustus, they were not universally venerated. Dio, well disposed to the *optimus princeps*, was concerned at stories concerning his boorishness in literary matters, his love of wine, and addiction to boys (66). And how would Tacitus have tackled Nerva's talents for erotic poetry? His views on Nero the artist were well known.

The *Annals* and *Histories* both open with claims to objectivity. What else could he say, at least in public? But need Pliny have been so coy about asking for his own inclusion in the historian's work (67)? Such a request had the respectable precedent of Cicero's overtures to Lucceius. Tacitus enunciated a principle of historiography that would accommodate Pliny : *praecipuum munus annalium reor ne virtutes sileantur utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit* (68).

Such a philosophy is no different from that pervading the *Agricola*. Recognition of this might at least do something to suppress the increasingly futile debates over the « purpose » of that monograph. Or at least put the issue back on the right lines. The *Agricola* was in some sense a short rehearsal of the *Annals* and *Histories*. *Hic interim liber* was no slack phrase. The monograph presented a tangible hero and a patent villain. In the

(64) *Hist.* 1.50.
(65) *Agr.* 7.3; 9.1; 13.5; 17.1; *Dial.* 8.3; 9.5; 17.3.
(66) Dio. 68. 7. 4.
(67) *Ep.* 7.33.10.
(68) *Ann.* 3.65.

Annals, Germanicus is the tragic hero, whose fate (like Agricola, he may have been poisoned) sets the pattern. It is no accident that his supposed persecutor was Tiberius, a villain largely interchangeable with Domitian ([69]).

Historians of the twentieth century can sympathise with Tacius. It was hazardous to live under Tiberius, Nero, or Domitian. But it could not be gainsaid that Tacitus, Agricola, Nerva, Verginius Rufus, and their ilk had done more than survive. They had actively prospered. Where was the distinction between themselves and men of the stamp of Fabricius Veiento? This paper is written in the year of the controversial memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev. Parallels are glib, but permissible. His account of the liquidation of Beria (arrested at a high level meeting to which he had been called) could be a doublet for the story of Sejanus. It is embarrassing to have survived a tyrant, when others have not. The formula of Tacitus, *posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse,* was designed for the moral comfort of emperors as well as an historian and his father-in-law.

The comfortable patterns, the confident clichés, the schematic registers of good and bad men, could not be sustained. The truth was brutally laid bare at that famous dinner party of Nerva, attended by Fabricius Veiento, Junius Mauricus, and Pliny. The old and new orders saw each other face to face. Like the humans and the pigs in *Animal Farm,* it was hard to distinguish them.

SUNTO. — Nelle opere maggiori di Tacito si inseriscono considerazioni sulle classi sociali, sull'atteggiamento degli intellettuali di fronte al potere, sul disagio di privati. Si analizzano punti specifici per dimostrare l'interrelazione di questi aspetti, e per dimostrare che la frase *posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse* è in modo imbarazzante vera.

([69]) Suet., *Domit.* 20, confirms the image; *Praeter commentarios et acta Tiberi Caesaris nihil lectitabat.* See K. H. Waters on the character of Domitian in *Phoenix* 18 (1964), 49 ff.

XLII

TACITEAN HUMOUR

"Tacitus would have been a better historian if he too had had a sense of humour."

This proclamation by V. Scramuzza[1]) takes unerring aim at the wrong target. What Cornelius Tacitus may be said to have lacked was a sense of proportion. A common failing of moralists, especially Roman ones. Consider the procedures of satirist and historian. In the monstrous regiment of women paraded by Juvenal, the expert in Vergilian studies is more noxious than the sadist and the adulteress[2]). Tacitus deposes the poetical pastimes of a Nero hard by the liquidation of Agrippina: the artistic *princeps* is as infamous as the matricide.

Of humour in Tacitus there is no lack. It is protean in mode and application, going far beyond the familiar mastery of epigram. The pigmentation, it is true, tends to the dark, with irony, sarcasm, and harsh cachinnation in dominance. Yet there was a lighter side: gaiety, parodies of various sorts, even the odd paronomasia.

Sententiae apart, it is not an aspect of Tacitus that has been much written about[3]). Hence the present contribution. But it will not do simply to aggregate examples from disparate passages and present an anthology of Taciteanisms. Humour is set to many purposes, only one of which is the cause of veracity. Scramuzza is twice wrong. Tacitus did possess a sense of humour. It is not, however, a faculty which assures the historian's quality.

---

[1]) The Emperor Claudius (1940), 21.

[2]) 6, 434f.: *illa tamen gravior* ...

[3]) For sententiae, see everyone who has essayed a discussion of Tacitean style; notably, B. R. Voss, Der pointierte Stil des Tacitus (1963). Syme easily annihilates Scramuzza with examples: Tacitus (1958 — hereinafter referred to by author's name), 539; cf. 206, 349/50, 472, 476. Yet humour is not a branch of Tacitus' style included in F. R. D. Goodyear's bibliographical survey Tacitus (1970), 35—42; or in his Development of Language and Style in the Annals of Tacitus, JRS 58 (1968), 22. It is similarly eschewed by N. P. Miller, Tacitus (1969), 99—116.

Better, then, to observe the techniques at work over a narrative that is rich in diversity of theme and personnel. Annals 14 lends itself admirably to such a programme. This book encompasses the years 59—62, a most dramatic period in the evolution of Nero's reign. The narrative opens with imperial matricide, terminates with hideous coniugicide. Between this sanguinary pair of episodes, interlaced with all manner of minor items, is a parade of momentous events: the début of Nero the artist; Corbulo's Eastern advance; Boudicca's insurrection in Britain; the first *maiestas* trials of the régime; the death of Burrus and (it is alleged) concomitant eclipse of Annaeus Seneca.

And the dramatis personae are not unworthy. The complex nature of Nero is emergent, more so than the senatorial annalist really desired. The young emperor is vain and temperate, timid and assertive, alternating between inane depravities and industrious concern for the minutiae of state affairs. Serving and manoeuvring, both alongside and below the *princeps*, are the failing and desperate dowager Agrippina, the shrewd and ruthless Poppaea Sabina, and the pathetically doomed Octavia. Balancing the triad of imperial women are Burrus, virtuous but adaptable; the deviously surviving Seneca; and the malevolent newcomer, Ofonius Tigellinus.

Complementing in their various roles are such minor figures as the willing but inefficient hatchet-man, Anicetus, and Acte, a player from the emperor's past and destined to recur at moments of drama. Peripheral to metropolitan events, but a good deal more vital, stand the generals: Corbulo in the East, Suetonius Paulinus at another extremity of empire in Britain. Also to be integrated into the narrative, and animadverted upon, are the collectives of soldiery, senate, and urban populace.

Such juxtapositions of themes and individuals were fecund in opportunities for the historian to indulge his techniques. We need only perpend the simplest props in the structure of this book. It opens with a mistress nagging the willing but irresolute emperor to liquidate his mother. Its closing tragedy is the murder of Octavia, hastened on at the behest of the same Poppaea, still nagging[4]).

---

[4]) Poppaea, in the first scene, *crebris criminationibus* (a patent sound effect, there!) *aliquando per facetias incusaret principem et pupillum* (only here in Tacitus) *vocaret.* Observe the very similar *secretis criminationibus incusaverat* in the last section of the book (of Romanus accusing Seneca). When she wishes to steel Nero to the removal of Octavia, we are treated to *varius sermo et ad metum atque iram accommodatus*, a phrase with close

A simple device, cunningly enhanced by linguistic iteration and parody. It is said of Nero, when finally persuaded to the matricide, that *diu meditatum scelus non ultra distulit*. In the other scene, reacting to the same female's goad, the emperor *posito metu nuptias Poppaeae ob eius modi terrores dilatas maturare parat*.

By 59, the young princeps was maturing in criminality, thanks to the exercise of power. *Vetustate imperii coalita audacia* is the historian's phrase. The parody is patent. Autocratic rule (*imperium*) teaches a timid villain how to exercise *audacia*, the hallmark of old Republican rascality[5]). And when Poppaea is upbraiding Nero's residual dubitations, she mocks him for lacking *non modo imperii sed libertatis etiam*.

A pretty picture indeed. The principate took *libertas* from Rome. But, in the words of a furious harlot, the incumbent Caesar has by weakness robbed himself of that same treasure. The mocking exploitation of political terminologies is a favourite technique of the Annals, first divined in the spoofing of the Augustan Res Gestae[6]).

Caution is a difficult and necessary virtue to maintain when expiscating subtleties of humour and linguistic nuance in one's author. In matters of iterated phrase or hypothetical parody, there may be less in it than meets the eye. Especially in regard to items which recur after a long stretch of intervening narrative.

Propinquity, however, imports confidence. Tacitus avers that Poppaea's campaign against Agrippina was nourished by the apathy of courtiers: *cupientibus cunctis infringi potentiam matris et credente nullo usque ad caedem eius duratura filii odia*. The very next sentence unveils the gossip concerning incestuous relations between mother and son: *tradit Cluvius ardore retinendae Agrippinam potentiae eo usque provectam ut ...*

Potentia is one of the historian's most cherished pejoratives[7]). Its use and repetition in the present context serve to remind the audience of two themes: Agrippina's own odious past (she is thus

---

links to both Seneca again (Ann. 13, 3), and Aper in the Dialogus. These phenomena are explored later in the present paper.

[5]) See C. Wirszubski, *Audaces* — a study in political phraseology, JRS 51 (1961), 12.

[6]) Thus Syme, 272, in pursuit of F. Haverfield, Four Notes on Tacitus, JRS 11 (1912), 195.

[7]) On *potentia* in Tacitus, consult Syme, 415, and the immense register of its uses in Gerber-Greef-John, Lexicon Taciteum (1903).

deprived of sympathy), and the transient quality of influence at a corrupt court. The concomitant iteration and variation of *usque ad* and *eo usque ut* augment the effect.

Incest is a family affair, but one of political import and moral concern at Rome. It inspired lesser chroniclers to coarse sexual detail. Suetonius had an account of semen-stained imperial garments in litters, which he blissfully retails[8]). Tacitus disdains that type of effect, without shrinking from the topic or surrendering its humorous side.

Instead, the historian opts for blaming Agrippina, with the remark that *credibilior novae libidinis meditatio in ea visa est*. Which anticipates the famous description of Nero as *incredibilium cupitor*. Adjoined to this is a delicately cutting résumé of her sexual transgressions from Lepidus to Pallas, a progress that is marked by another employment of *usque ad*.

Tacitus trusts us to appreciate the ultimate irony of the incest for ourselves. He refrains from any reminder that the nuptials of Agrippina and Claudius had themselves been, in the letter of the law, incestuous. That episode had already been described[9]), with contempt shown for the venal prattle of Vitellius about the mutability of moral law.

A single word links the two sequences for the discerning reader. It is *inlecebrae*, quite a favourite with the historian and here marvellously employed. In her pursuit of Claudius, the charms of Agrippina clinched the oratory of her champion: *praevaluere haec adiuta Agrippinae inlecebris*. Alas, by 59 she was a faded Helen, not even able (in some accounts) to compete with the discarded but suddenly revived Acte, who was rushed in when Seneca *contra muliebris inlecebras subsidium a femina petivisse*[10]).

There follows the account of schemes and preparations for the matricide. It is coldly brilliant. Possible modes of assassination, and the final solution, are set down in a manner that resembles a summary of transactions in political assembly or philosophical debate. Two uses of *placuit* and one of *docet*, employed to signal the agreed plans, enhance the conceit.

Enter, like a first murderer in Marlowe or Shakespeare, Anicetus. This imperial utensil is one of Tacitus' small masterpieces.

---

[8]) Nero 28, 2.

[9]) Ann. 12, 1—8.

[10]) Ann. 12, 3; 14, 2. Is the almost identical placing in the two books coincidental?

Imported immediately after the register of rejected ways of murder, he is brought in with the phrase *obtulit ingenium*, half a dactylic hexameter[11]) and redolent of a physical urgency that contrasts with the ineffectual theorising just surveyed.

Anicetus is sardonically labelled as *pueritiae Neronis educator*. This latter noun is restricted by Tacitus to sinister episodes in the Claudian and Neronian sections of the Annals[12]). The previous (and first, in the extant volumes) *educator* to appear was the tutor of Britannicus, a certain Sosibius, who taught Claudius to distrust Valerius Asiaticus, and who was an early victim of Agrippina[13]). The humour of Anicetus' new lessons in matricide for his old pupil is flagrant. He blithely ticks off the advantages inherent in his scheme of the collapsing boat, attaining the peaks of cynicism with the casual *additurum principem defunctae templum et aras et cetera ostentandae pietati*.

There are moments, of course, when Tacitus overreaches himself in the search for comic effect. Nero seduces his mother to Baiae with counterfeit regret over their recent estrangement, confident that she will (as she does) accept his overtures *facili feminarum credulitate ad gaudia*. Like most of his kind, the historian relished generalisations to the discredit of the opposite sex[14]). But the chronicler of the Julio-Claudians, especially one who had consulted and believed the dowager's memoirs[15]), must have known that Agrippina was the last woman guilty of facile female optimism.

The imperial mother is invited to her last supper with the thought that night would serve *occultando facinori*. A vain hope, for within three sentences the historian is ironically complimenting the gods for providing a bright night and calm waters *quasi convincendum ad scelus*. The actual account of the collapsing boat is both muddled and inconsistent with the original scheme[16]). Either

[11]) Assuming that the scrap of verse is intentional. Very often, such items were not: notably, I think, the supposed hexametric ("poetic" would hardly be the word) opening to the Annals. For this opinion, and a survey of pertinent literature, see Goodyear, The Annals of Tacitus, 1 (1972), 89.

[12]) *Educator* (reinforcing our *placuit - docet* phenomenon?) occurs at Ann. 11, 1 (Sosibius); 12, 41; 13, 15; 15, 62 (Seneca).

[13]) Dio 60, 32, 5.

[14]) Registered and reviewed in my Women in Tacitus, Prudentia 4 (1972), 83.

[15]) Ann. 4, 53 (on the elder Agrippina asking Tiberius to find her a husband).

[16]) See A. Dawson, Whatever happened to Lady Agrippina? CJ 64 (1969), 253.

Tacitus was confused by discrepant sources and a personal ignorance of maritime technology, or he wished to expose the combination of ruthlessness and inefficiency in Anicetus and Nero by a combination of stylistic effects, sometimes achieved at the expense of plausibility.

One cannot be sure. What, for instance, are we to make of his phrase *dedere facultatem lenioris in mare iactus*, explaining how the survivors were tumbled harmlessly into the waters by the rival movements of innocent and guilty crew members? A tortured circumlocution, or a piece of deliberate farce?

Within this sequence, a fine vignette of Acerronia, the companion of Agrippina, is achieved, in terms of balance with Anicetus and tragi-comic effect. Before the roof (literally and obscurely) falls in, she is sitting at her mistress' feet, uttering alliterative optimisms in the manner of Cicero on his consulship: *paenitentiam filii et reciperatam matris gratiam per gaudium memorabat*. When floundering in the water, she is overcome by a wave of *imprudentia*, and calls out that she is the emperor's mother. With fatal results, for she is promptly clubbed to death *contis et remis et quae fors obtulerat navalibus telis*.

In this scene, Tacitus displays his variegated mastery. Acerronia's death anticipates that of her mistress, who will be hit on the head with a belaying-pin before the fatal stab. The verb *obtulerat* takes us back to Anicetus, architect of the crime, and the felicitous *obtulit ingenium*. Yet a final matter is left for the audience to decide: did Acerronia hope to save herself by claiming to be Agrippina, or had she divined the plot and had attempted to deflect the assassins from her mistress?

The final scenes of the matricidal saga cut from villa to villa with a technique comparable to the film director's camera. First, we are taken inside Agrippina's residence, to be shown that in the midst of her disillusion and dangers she can retain her greed for money: *testamentum Acerroniae requiri bonaque obsignari iubet, id tantum non per simulationem*. The epigram usurps the role of feminine credulity, for which there is no longer any scope.

When Nero learns of his mother's escape, he howls for help. His first thoughts turn to Burrus and Seneca. That pretty pair are sleeping through the excitement, *incertum an et ante ignaros*[17]).

[17]) Retaining *ignaros* from *M* (with Nipperdey) instead of the marginal *gnaros* preferred by, e. g., Fisher and Furneaux. Despite the latter's convoluted note, it boils down to much the same thing; cf. Dio 61, 12, 1 for the claim that Seneca had earlier urged the matricide.

Dragged from their possibly amoral slumbers, they can at first think of nothing to say: *longum utriusque silentium*, observes the historian, and we can well believe it. Eventually, Seneca recovers himself and, like the good Stoic he is not, attempts to put Burrus on the spot: *Seneca hactenus promptius ut respiceret Burrum ac sciscitaretur an militi imperanda caedes esset*. The prefect learning by example is now thinking as fast as the philosopher and cautiously replies that his men are *toti Caesarum domui obstrictos memoresque Germanici nihil adversus progeniem eius atrox ausuros*.

Lest Nero miss these very palpable hints, Burrus subjoins that *perpetraret Anicetus promissa*. Our *educator*, undaunted by his parlous situation, pledges to complete the matricide, which he does. That final part of the story is hauntingly told by Tacitus, with no intrusion of tasteless humour[18]). Other and more suitable effects are brought into play. The hired killers Herculeius and Obaritus, for splendid example, are properly debased by the syntactical trick of making them an ablative of instrument: *prolocuta respicit Anicetum trierarcho Herculeio et Obarito centurione classiario comitatum*. And the audience is nicely reminded of Nero the artist by the phrase *scaenam ultro criminis parat*, employed in the brief description of the framing of Agerinus.

The aftermath of the murder evokes a blend of comic effects similar to what has preceded. Typical malice is shown in the weighing of possible motives for the suicide of Agrippina's libertus Mnester at her pyre: *incertum caritate in patronam an metu exitii*. Indeed, unless we assume that he feared torture, the historian's suggestion is absurd, for can a man who kills himself with a sword be thought to fear death? Perhaps *exilii* should be read[19])?

An aphorism such as *non ut hominum vultus ita locorum facies mutantur* requires no comment, save that it partly prepares for the later explanation of Anicetus' eclipse between 59 and 62: *quia malorum facinorum ministri quasi exprobrantes aspiciuntur* (14, 62). The epigrams are linked by both circumstance and personnel. A smaller effect is the iterated use of *summa*, first (14, 7) in the case of Anicetus pledging to finish his murderous work (*poscit summam*

---

[18]) The sequence is instructively analysed by K. Quinn, Latin Explorations (1963), ch. 5.

[19]) That is, if one wishes to rescue Tacitus. The change is obviously a facile one, perhaps supported by the presence of *exitium* in the next few sentences, which could have produced a false iteration.

sceleris) and again in Nero's sending of a self-exculpating letter to the senate (*quarum summa erat ...*).

Thanksgivings and festivals follow in abundance. For an historian who liked to exhibit irreverence in minor supernatural matters, they were in some sense a godsend. For a plethora of prodigies attended, some conventional, others hilariously at the expense of women. One lady gave birth to a snake, another even more dramatically was hit by lightning whilst making love with her husband: *anguem enixa mulier et alia in concubitu mariti fulmine exanimata.* As well Tacitus was innocent of the Freudian blight; otherwise he could not have enjoyed the Epicurean explanation that these stirring events *adeo sine cura deum eveniebant ut multos post annos Nero imperium et scelera continuaverit.*

Nero the charioteer and artist brings out the best and worst in Tacitus. As earlier adumbrated, the innocuous and indeed commendable private pastimes of the emperor are scathingly juxtaposed with the matricide, and treated with absurd contempt. One wonders how the historian would have faced an accounting of the hobbies of that *optimus princeps* Trajan, which we know to have been hunting and boating, drink and boys[20]). Venation was all right, for Tacitus himself and Pliny indulged in that[21]). But the others?

All the comic resources of Tacitean style are marshalled against the imperial diversions. It is an occasion for the dispensing of lordly epigrams against those concerned. An easy and favourite target is the urban mob, both goading and goaded by their ruler: *ut est vulgus cupiens voluptatum et, si eodem princeps trahat, laetum.* Men of quality who participated are altogether unmentionable: *quos fato perfunctos ne nominatim tradam, maioribus eorum tribuendum puto.* Some particular scorn is reserved for the *equites* who diligently performed the tasks of the claqueur *quasi per virtutem clari honoratique agere.*

Logic and consistency do not thrive in passages of sustained diatribe. Yet there is one notable genuflection towards the former. Tacitus allows that these grovelling knights had little choice of action: *quod merces ab eo qui iubere potest vim necessitatis adfert.* The way is here being cleared for the memorable conclusion to the

---

[20]) Pliny, Paneg. 81/82, describes the outdoor pastimes; Dio 68, 7, 4 worries about drink and boys.

[21]) Notably Pliny, Ep. 1, 6 (to Tacitus); see Sherwin-White on the passage.

interview between Nero and Seneca later in the book: *Seneca, qui finis omnium cum dominante sermonum, grates agit* (14, 56).

After much general moralising and denunciation, Nero is finally brought on to the stage. The imperial début is a gorgeous compound of arrogance and nerves. *Postremus ipse scaenam incedit*, begins the narrative. The verb connotes decisive or majestic gait on the part of conquerors or gods. Applied to the despot previously described as *publici servitii victor* (14, 13), the verb has sardonic point. It may also conjure up farce, for dignity of gait may have been beyond this emperor with his paunch and very slender legs[22]). And in the very last sequence of imperial pleasures, before we are abruptly transferred to the more edifying scenes of Corbulo in the East, *incedo* is the verb chosen to describe Nero's sacrilegious plunge into the waters of the Marcian aqueduct and fountain, an act that resulted in one of the only three illnesses he suffered in fourteen years of depravity[23]).

But in his very moment of proud advent upon the stage, the *princeps* is in the grip of nerves, still desperately tuning up and snatching tips from his teachers: *multa cura temptans citharam et praemeditans adsistentibus phonascis*. Here we glance with profit at the Suetonian account of these doings. The biographer copiously confirms the emperor's artistic nerves, mentioning that he never performed *nisi astante phonasco*[24]). This phrase may confirm *phonascis* in our present passage: it is not always remembered that this is the correction of Muretus for the meaningless *facies* of *M. Phonascus* had the right flavour, Hellenic and trivial. The similarity of jest and phrase provokes certain hoary questions concerning who is copying whom?

Temptans, praemeditans, adsistentibus; the triad of present participles vivifies the comic spectacle of the apprehensive artist. Two more are produced in the next sentence, to create that famous capsule sketch of Burrus: *maerens ac laudans*[25]). It is all too easy to forget with what discrimination the virtuous prefect wept. There was no hint of a tear when he was organising the *adulatio* for Nero's slaying of his mother a little earlier (14, 10).

[22]) Suetonius, Nero 51.

[23]) Ann. 14, 22; Suetonius, Nero 51.

[24]) Nero 25, 3; the word occurs at Aug. 84, 2 in the biographer (*dabat assidue phonasco operam*).

[25]) Syme, 349, well calls the technique "brief collocation of the incongruous", and neatly adduces *falsi ac festinantes* (Ann. 1, 7). Gibbon liked the Burrus vignette, translating as "mournful and applauding".

Not content with denigration and ridicule of Nero the driver and musician, Tacitus proceeds to accuse Nero the poet of plagiarism or the exploitation of ghost-writers: *carminum quoque studium adfectavit, contractis quibus aliqua pangendi facultas necdum insignis erat.* We recall, but need not here discuss, the disagreement of Suetonius, who was convinced of the authenticity of the imperial verses[26]). More to the point is a word on the limitations of Syme's treatment of this whole issue[27]). He adduces an earlier passage of the Annals (13, 3), where the phrase *pangendis carminibus* is employed in a résumé of Nero's cultural activities. Noting that these two passages are the only ones in which the historian uses *pango* in the context of versifying, Syme announces that Tacitus' words in the earlier of the sections "excite the distrust of the reader."

They should, but not quite along the lines given. In the earlier passage, Tacitus is sardonic about Nero's poetical pastimes, but he evinces no doubt as to their genuineness: *aliquando carminibus pangendis inesse sibi elementa doctrinae ostendebat.* The accusation of plagiarism betrays the willingness of Cornelius Tacitus to sacrifice facts (or, at the very least, consistency) in the cause of epigram. It is not the only case to be encountered in Book 14 of the Annals. One need but observe the introduction of Faenius Rufus (14, 51) as a man whose *segnem innocentiam* (along with the alliterative *flagrantissima flagitia* of Tigellinus) inspired *grande desiderium* for the defunct paragon Burrus. One book later (15, 50), Faenius recurs as a character *vita famaque laudatum*!

A propos of *pango*, it may be that we have an infrequent echo of Horace in Tacitus. Syme very reasonably stated that "the historian Tacitus is not notably in the debt of Horace", and adduces only one possibility, from the Epistles[28]). However, and this is not to say that a precedent has to be sought for the Tacitean phrase, one remembers *poemata panges*, again from the Epistles[29]). Acceptance of this as a conscious echo would at least make a change from the eternal quest after Vergilianisms in the historian.

---

[26]) Nero 52. It is significant that Pliny's register of imperial poets (Ep. 5, 3, 5) accepts Nero as an occasional practitioner (*aliquando a malis* — which recalls Ann. 13, 3).

[27]) 349.

[28]) 357 (associating Ann. 2, 14 with Ep. 1, 11, 6).

[29]) 1, 18, 40. But *cavete*! Lucretius has *pango* of *carmina* (DRN 1, 25; 1, 935).

The elaborate mockery of the Neronia is replete with *crambe repetita;* yet it contains what might be Tacitus' funniest joke. To savour it fully, one has to recall an earlier allegation that Nero was the first *princeps* to require *aliena facundia*[30]). Now, in his new festival, we are given the poker-faced news that *eloquentiae primas nemo tulit, sed victorem esse Caesarem pronuntiatum.* Which is postluded by the last sentence on the whole subject of cultural trends and affectations. Tacitus elects a limp conclusion, bearing upon a trivial sartorial item: *Graeci amictus quis per eos dies plerique incesserant tum exoleverunt* (14, 21). The return of our verb *incedo* will not be overlooked by the connoisseur of Tacitean risibility.

Items peripheral to the major narrative lend themselves to the techniques — or can be made to. Investigation by the authorities into the bloody "soccer riot" at Pompeii prompts a beautiful formulation of passing the buck: *cuius rei iudicium princeps senatui, senatus consulibus permisit. et rursus re ad patres relata ...* The scandal of a forged will at Rome (14, 40) involved one Asinius Marcellus, a descendant of the great Pollio. Tacitus rings the changes on the weary theme of *captatio* by concentrating on this acidulous assessment of Marcellus: *proavo clarus neque morum spernendus habebatur nisi quod paupertatem praecipuum malorum credebat.* One thinks at once of Juvenal's *nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se / quam quod ridiculos homines facit.* This is not to suggest that the historian is directly influenced by Juvenal here, for the satirist's aphorism is reproduced almost verbatim from Plautus[31]). But Tacitus might be poking a little quiet fun at ethical commonplaces here; certainly, the insertion of an unparalleled construction (*morum spernendus*) helps to keep banality at bay.

When dealing with war, "this most unmilitary of historians"[32]) does not demean himself by "sick" humour at the expense of its victims. Tacitus persists instead in his customary snide remarks about people and peoples. A safe and sorry slur on the enemies faced by Corbulo represents them as *facilem mutatu gentem, ut segnem ad pericula ita infidam ad occasiones* (14, 23). That vignette is unremarkably similar to his caustic sentence on Egypt and its inhabitants

---

[30]) Ann. 13, 3; the claim is probably refuted by Suetonius, Nero 47, 2, who mentions that a speech was found after the emperor's death in his *scrinium*, written as an appeal to the people in 68, obviously not by Seneca.

[31]) Juvenal 3, 152/53; cf. Plautus, Stichus 2, 1, 17f. See Mayor's note for a galaxy of parallels, Greek and Latin.

[32]) Mommsen's phrase, of course.

elsewhere[33]). The British narrative was richer in possibilities. Which may be one reason, apart from the obvious thoughts of Agricola's role in these events, why it receives twice as much space as the Eastern affairs.

Suetonius Paulinus is introduced in the eye-catching phrase *Corbulonis concertator*, comic by dint of its sound and weight (the latter quality reinforced by the archaism *perduellibus* in the same sentence), and perhaps involving a neologism[34]). Comedy at the expense of Boudicca is pleasingly absent. The barbs are reserved for the infamous freedman Polyclitus (14, 39), and the new governor. The latter of course is Petronius Turpilianus, whose alleged demerits occupy the final sentence of the narrative, balancing the exordium (14, 29) with its formal reference to Petronius' consulate as the year of the *gravis clades* in Britain. The structural detail is small, but it imports a certain irony and was contrived with care.

Turpilianus is the victim of one of the historian's most misdirected darts: *is non inritato hoste neque lacessitus honestum pacis nomen segni otio imposuit*. It is also one that had first been aimed in the Agricola[35]), both at Petronius and his successor Trebellius Maximus, who *segnior* (a favourite term of obtrectation in Tacitus) *et nullis castrorum experimentis, comitate quadam curandi provinciam tenuit*.

In the version of the sarcasm worked up for the Annals, there may be an implied parody of the tag *nemo me impune lacessit*. The dusting off of old jests and the patent bias of Tacitus against most British governors other than his father-in-law do not enhance his image as an historian. But tolerance is to be enjoined. As that fine wit Sydney Smith once observed, "No pecuniary embarrassments are equal to the embarrassments of a professed wit: an eternal demand upon him for pleasantry, and a consciousness on his part of a limited income of the facetious; the disappointment of his creditors — the importunity of duns — the tricks, forgeries and false coin he is forced to pay instead of gold. Pity a wit."

Between military narrative and (for Tacitus) the grimmer theme of *maiestas* trials are inserted four small episodes; they are of minor importance, disparate, and productive of humour. The condemnation of Tarquitius Priscus for extortion in Bithynia was accomplished *magno patrum gaudio:* Priscus was notorious for his

[33]) Hist. 1, 11.

[34]) *Concertator* occurs only here in extant Roman literature.

[35]) Agric. 16, 3—4.

earlier prosecution of Statilius Taurus, his own governor. Cases of a man being hoisted with his own petard are quite liked by the historian; Book 14 actually closes with another example, involving no less a personage than Annaeus Seneca.

Census-taking in the Gallic provinces might seem a humdrum topic. Even this is turned to good account, thanks to a futile quarrel between two of the three officials concerned. Q. Volusius and Sextius Africanus vied with each other, disdaining their colleague Trebellius Maximus. The result? *Trebellium dum uterque dedignatur, supra tulere.*

The passing of Memmius Regulus permits the reflection that this celebrated fellow was famous, *in quantum praeumbrante imperatoris fastigio datur* (14, 47). This mot was originally rehearsed in the Agricola[36]), of Frontinus: *vir magnus, quantum licebat.* Obnubilation by a great name will remind the audience of Lucan's *stat magni nominis umbra;* and indeed, influence by this poet upon Tacitus has been divined by some[37]). Memmius was famous because Nero had once spoken of him as the state's best *subsidium*, should the emperor himself decease. The anecdote is followed by this: *vixit tamen post haec Regulus* ... That *tamen* is brilliantly located.

Finally, Nero's dedication of a gymnasium is shrugged off with a back-handed reference to *Graeca comitate.* This is the second occurrence in this Book of a slighting allusion to Hellenic fashions as a way of achieving a pathetic conclusion to a section.

The Tacitean account of the first *maiestas* trials of Nero's reign is highly incomplete and self-contradictory[38]). Nowhere is it explained why the portentous machinery of a treason trial should have been rolled in against such minor offenders as Antistius Sosianus and (at this season) Fabricius Veiento. The historian limply suggests that Nero was looking for a chance to enhance his clement image by mitigating a senatorial death sentence. But an emperor could have done that without resuscitating *maiestas* trials; and after his intervention in 61 to save the freedmen of Pedanius Secundus (14, 42), his reputation was in no urgent need of refurbishing.

[36]) Agric. 17, 3.

[37]) See Syme, 143 and 357, who cites L. Robbert De Tacito Lucani imitatore (Göttingen dissertation, 1917 — inaccessible to me) for the conclusion that such influence was limited. Notice that *praeumbro* occurs only here in Tacitus.

[38]) See my Executions, Trials, and Punishments in the Reign of Nero, Parola del Passato 117 (1967), 425.

For Tacitus, the sinister occasion is an opportunity for another batch of epigrams, and he makes the most of it. It allows the contemptuous introduction of Aulus Vitellius as *adulatione promptissimus, optimum quemque iurgio lacessens et respondenti reticens, ut pavida ingenia solent.* Lest anyone miss this far from subtle animadversion, Tacitus adorns it with his only extant use of *reticeo* with a dative[39]).

The last sentence of the account of Antistius' trial awards credit and discredit in equal measure to Thrasea Paetus. The Stoic acted *sueta firmitudine animi et ne gloria intercideret* (14, 49). This reminiscence of a famous remark in the Agricola about *inani iactatione libertatis* is not wholly misdirected. However, when Thrasea stalked out of the senate in 59, refusing to join in the pusillanimous celebrations for Agrippina's removal, his bravery is commended and his motives go unchallenged (14, 12). Why, then, the present thrust? A reference back to Nero's alleged reason for allowing *maiestas* proceedings against the defendant provides part of the answer. *Imperatori gloriam quaeri:* a phrase designed to be balanced by *ne gloria intercideret.*

The iterative technique also serves to integrate these *maiestas* proceedings and what they portended for Rome with the narrative immediately subsequent. It was alleged against Antistius that *probrosa adversus principem carmina factitavit;* it will presently be urged against Seneca that *carmina crebrius factitare*[40]) (14, 52).

The phrase *carmina factitare* comports two sound effects: solemnity and jingle. Instantaneous balance and reinforcement is furnished by the short notice of Veiento's exile (14, 50). He, too, was adept at *carmina probrosa*, though preferred to assail senators and priests rather than the emperor. One would have thought Nero, himself not above composing lampoons against individuals of rank[41]), might have enjoyed Veiento's squibs. And Tacitus as much as admits that it was hard for the senate to engage the imperial interest in this case. Only after a supplementary charge of trafficking in offices was added, did Nero enter the affair (*quae causa Neronis fuit suscipiendi iudicii*). Tacitus inserts two frequentative

---

[39]) A Livian usage (e. g. 3, 41, 3; 23, 12, 9), not noticed by Syme, 733/34, in his remarks on Livian style in Tacitus.

[40]) For other examples: Ann. 6, 39; 16, 14 (recalling the Antistius affair); 16, 28.

[41]) Suetonius, Dom. 1, 1 mentions a poem entitled Luscio, aimed at the praetor Clodius Pollio.

verbs in this narrative. Veiento was accused of *venditata munera* — a verb employed only here in the Annals, and once in the Histories[42]). The verses of Veiento were banned, burned, and much read. That is, as long as they were suppressed, for the historian is quick to append an appropriately caustic reminder of the paradoxical futility of censorship: *mox licentia habendi oblivionem attulit*. But before that, the books were *lectitatos:* this verb occurs nowhere else in Tacitus.

Dark events might be deemed a logical inspiration for black humour. The collocation is not absolute in the case of Cornelius Tacitus. There are two probable puns in Book 14, both in grim contexts. A highly exaggerated generalisation describes the situation in Rome in 62 as worsening daily: *gravescentibus in dies publicis malis* (14, 51). This calamitous decline is signalled by the death of Burrus who, perhaps expedited by poison, died *tumescentibus faucibus*. One can at least argue for a deliberate play on sounds here.

The second case is a pithier one. The first two victims of the malignant Tigellinus were Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix and Rubellius Plautus (14, 57). There followed the liquidation of poor Octavia. Before her dismissal under armed guard to Campania, we are informed that she *domumque Burri, praedia Plauti, infausta dona accipit* (14, 60). In this context of three certain and one possible victim of Nero's, *infausta* appeals as a play on the name of Sulla, especially as it is placed immediately after *Plauti*.

At this stage in Book 14, there is a sudden plethora of severed heads, enough to delight an Iris Murdoch. Poppaea receives that of Octavia (14, 64). Those of Sulla and Plautus are sent to Nero. In each case, the emperor makes a crude joke. He mocks the head of Sulla *tanquam praematura canitie deforme*, and laughed at the long nose of Plautus[43]). These degenerate items are recorded as unchallenged facts, unlike the earlier and similar issue of his viewing and commending of Agrippina's cadaver (14, 9), where it is admitted that *sunt qui tradiderint, sunt qui abnuant*. The later anecdotes, gross and implicitly beyond debate, serve to develop the image of a totally corrupted *princeps*, now at the mercy of Tigellinus and Poppaea, who stand in arrogant and bloody replacement of Burrus and Seneca. And they were much needed by the historian, for attentive reading of Book 15 discloses no murder or *maiestas* in 63,

[42]) Hist. 1, 66; cf. Hist. 1, 49 (of Galba): *famae nec incuriosus nec venditator*.

[43]) Accepting Halm's supplement of the lacuna in Tacitus' text, achieved by recourse to Dio 62, 14, 1.

and only the suicide of Torquatus Silanus (excluding the fire and the Christians) to upset the quietude of 64. We may hope that restraint after the manner of Burrus was exercised in 63 by one of that year's consuls: the eximious Verginius Rufus! *Gravescentibus in dies publicis malis* was an image remote from the reality.

In the first clumsy moves against Octavia, Nero had recourse to that bungling and crude instrument of matricide, Anicetus. In terms of humour, his recurrence is a doublet. He is brought back on a farcically pompous note: *visus idoneus maternae necis patrator* (14, 62). Which recalls *pueritiae Neronis educator*. The sonorous *patrator*, only here in Tacitus, is designed also to conjure up two phrases from the account of the matricide: *patrati facinoris* (14, 7) and *facinus patraturus* (14, 8). And could there be a hint of *pater* in *patrator*, coming as it does after *maternae necis?*

We recall the throwaway cynicism of Anicetus' advice to Nero on how to achieve the death of a mother. This is now visited upon himself by his newly adept old pupil, the emperor, who calmly itemises possibilities and consequences: *nec manu aut telo opus* (a sarcastic reminder of how crudely Anicetus had had to redeem the failure of his collapsing boat): *fateretur Octaviae adulterium* (reminding the audience of the incest charged between mother and son). *occulta quidem ad praesens sed magna ei praemia et secessus amoenos promittit, vel, si negavisset, necem intentat.* This compound of vague promises and smiling threats is a far cry from the timid and effusive Nero of 59. As we earlier saw, the two sequences are openly linked by a pair of epigrams on human faces and remembrance of crimes. The promise of *secessus amoenos* is dramatic irony of high quality. For within two sentences, Anicetus is exiled to Sardinia (an island less fashionable than nowadays), where *non inops* (a perfect meiosis here) *exilium toleravit et fato obiit.*

The last event recorded in Book 14 (and the ultimate metropolitan item of consequence for the year 62) is Seneca's successful hoisting of his accuser, Romanus, with his own petard. Romanus had alleged *secretis criminationibus* that Seneca was too friendly with Piso. It is clear why the episode was selected as a terminus for this section of the Annals. *Unde Pisoni timor et orta insidiarum in Neronem magna moles et improspera* is a prolepsis sinister enough to tide us over the next two relatively peaceful years until that famous conspiracy is finally hatched.

One detects here also the usual linguistic tricks. Romanus is *perculsus* at the craftier hands of Seneca, just as the latter was

allegedly *perculso* earlier in the year, suffering in his turn *criminationibus* (14, 52—57)[44]). More examples of the technique could be adduced, from various quarters. One will suffice, serving as it does to keep the historian's picture of Seneca in focus. Poppaea's persuasion of Nero to get rid of Octavia was the fruition of a *varius sermo et ad metum atque iram accommodatus* (14, 62). The expression recalls the comment on Seneca's style, in the case of his notorious eulogy of Claudius, prepared for the ineloquent Nero: *ut fuit illi viro ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum* (13, 3)[45]).

Scramuzza was doubly wrong, as I said before and would now claim to have proved. But the formal verdict of Syme (476) on this crucial aspect of Tacitean technique requires a vital supplement. He pronounced thus: "the author of the Annales is ruthless and ironical. At the same time gaiety and tolerance are disclosed in the speeches; and in the course of the work his sense of humour appears to grow deeper and wider." That is all right, so long as we confess that humour in an historian must be simultaneously applauded and suspected, relished and dissected. It can infract the truth as well as bedizen it.

The best conclusion may be furnished by Aper in the Dialogus (20f.). He avers that an orator has to supply *poeticus decor* from Horace and Vergil and Lucan. Epigrams acquire fame through their emulation by disciples, and their dissimination *in colonias ac provincias*. Successful orations are those which *ad auris iudicantium cum voluptate perveniunt*.

Which takes us back to Tacitus on Seneca. And, indeed, the quip about *ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum* is reworked from Aper's *oratio auribus iudicum accommodata* (21, 2). Tacitus on Seneca is Tacitus on Tacitus.

---

[44]) See D. C. A. Shotter, Two Notes on Tacitus, CP 64 (1969), 109, with my rejoinder in CP 65 (1970), 187.

[45]) Adduce Ann. 2, 66; 16, 30; Dial. 21; 29. Note 4 to the present paper is relevant here.

XLIII

POSSIBLE HORATIAN ECHOES IN TACITUS

Exigitur enim iam ab oratore etiam poeticus decor, non Accii aut Pacuvii veterno inquinatus, sed ex Horatii et Virgilii et Lucani sacrario prolatus. That is a piece of advice tendered by Aper in the Dialogus (20, 5). Detecting Virgilian influences is a traditional pastime[1]). And Lucan has received his share of attention in this regard[2]). Yet Horace has gone largely neglected. Syme[3]) indeed, citing no study of the matter and adducing only one passage, was content with the conclusion that "the historian Tacitus is not notably in the debt of Horace".

This paper offers two things. First, an aggregation of passages exhibiting possible Horatian colour. Any such enterprise is hazardous, requiring due caution and honesty. Given the common repertoire of language and style, and the loss of so much relevant Roman literature (the Historiae of Sallust stand out in the present context), it is rarely legitimate to claim any certainty. Nevertheless, there is sufficient accumulation of suggestive parallels to permit the view that Tacitus did wish on occasion to impart a recognisably Horatian tinge to his style.

Secondly, the extent to which Horace was read and appreciated in the century and a half after his death is documented in support of the contention that neglect of the poet by Tacitus would have been more surprising than his exploitation. This both enhances the assembled linguistic statistics and amplifies the somewhat tame view of Gudeman (in his edition of the Dialogus) that "Horaz verdankt seine Erwähnung in diesem Mustertrio vielleicht hauptsächlich dem Umstand, daß er wohl schon damals einer der Hauptschulschriftsteller war, doch mußte seine feindselige Haltung gegenüber den ‚Alten' ihn einem Aper besonders sympathisch erscheinen lassen".

[1]) See H. Schmaus, Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils (Erlangen, 1884); N. P. Miller, Virgil and Tacitus, PVS 1 (1961/62), 25–34.

[2]) L. Robert, De Tacito Lucani imitatore (Göttingen, 1917).

[3]) Tacitus (Oxford, 1958), 357. Bibliographical surveys subsequent to Syme disclose no pertinent item.

Ann. 1, 51, 1: *avidas legiones*. Furneaux[4]) regarded this use of *avidus* without qualification as directly taken from Odes 3, 4, 58/59: *hinc avidus stetit/Vulcanus*. Older commentators on Horace (e. g. Wickham) also make the equation. More recently, however, it has been noted[5]) that the idiom was quite popular in Flavian epic: Silius 3, 305; 9, 316; Statius, Theb. 10, 859; 11, 535. This is a perfect illustration of the basic problem earlier emphasised: by which particular author was Tacitus influenced? His employment of *avidus* in this way could have come directly from Horace or have been mediated via later writers. One assumes he was familiar with contemporary epic — indeed, if the First Satire of Juvenal is any guide, how could he not have been! — but if (for instance) he shared the low opinion of Silius Italicus evinced by the younger Pliny[6]), he will have been no admirer or conscious imitator. At all events, Horace in this particular matter seems to have been an influence on Flavian epic; that in itself is worth knowing.

Ann. 1, 53, 4: *prave facundus*. The *pudens prave* of Ars poet. (AP) 88 seems a more likely model than the Sallustian *pravissume per sceleris immanitatem adhuc tutus fuit* (Hist. 1, 55, 6 Maurenbrecher) adduced and preferred by Goodyear. Both Tacitus and Horace have the simple adverb, pithily applied to a moral or intellectual quality.

Ann. 1, 68, 6: *post grave vulnus*. This pregnant construction (cf. Hist. 3, 49, 1: *post Cremonam*) is derived by Furneaux from Odes 1, 18, 5: *post vina*; 3, 21, 19: *post te*. His confidence is misplaced; the dictionaries confirm the usage in a variety of authors, prose and verse, from Cicero to Statius.

Ann. 2, 14, 5: *pavidos adversis, inter secunda* . . . Cf. Agric. 35, 4: *promptior in spem et firmus adversis*. Furneaux adduced Odes 2, 10, 13: *sperat infestis, metuit secundis*. In all of these cases, there has been much dispute over the grammar. With regard to Horace, Wickham took *infestis* and *secundis* to be ablatives absolute,

---

[4]) Except when otherwise noted, all references to Furneaux are to his edition of the Annals (Oxford, 1884 & 1896: Vol. 1; 1891: Vol. 2).

[5]) By F. D. R. Goodyear, in the first volume of his edition of the Annals (Cambridge, 1972), following G. B. A. Fletcher, Annotations on Tacitus (Brussels-Berchem, 1964), 12. This very valuable collection of notes, subsuming much of the author's earlier articles in CR 59 (1945), 45—50 and AJP 66 (1945), 13—37, is hereinafter referred to by its author's name.

[6]) Ep. 3, 7, 5: *scribebat carmina maiore cura quam ingenio*. Such snappy verdicts were, of course, typical of the times. One recalls Quintilian on Lucan (10, 1, 90); or, for that matter, Tacitus on Nero the poet (Ann. 14, 16).

whereas Page insisted they were datives. Similarly with Tacitus, Furneaux followed Nipperdey in calling the cases ablatives, against Draeger[7]). Whatever they are[8]), Tacitus seems to be in imitation of Horace. The construction is similar, if not identical; the linguistic echoes (*adversis/infestis*, *secunda/secundis*) are striking; and the phrase is postluded in the very next sentence by:

Ann. 2, 14, 6: *taedio viarum ac maris*. Regarded by Draeger, Furneaux, and others[9]) as the most patent reminiscence of Horace in Tacitus, thanks to Ep. 1, 11, 6: *odio maris atque viarum*; Odes 2, 6, 7: *lasso maris et viarum*.

Ann. 3, 45, 3: *in fronte statuerat ferratos*. The last word betokens the *cruppellarii*; Tacitus may have had the *agmina ferrata* (also referring to Celtic barbarians) of Odes 4, 14, 29/30 in mind.

Ann. 3, 48, 1: *impiger militiae*. This locution (also in Hist. 1, 87, 4) is claimed by Furneaux as unique to Tacitus. Fletcher may well be right in seeing it as influenced by Ep. 2, 1, 124: *militiae quamquam piger*. This is attractive, but it must be remembered that Tacitus is addicted to this sort of genitive construction[10]): cf. Hist. 2, 5, 1: *acer militiae*[11]); 3, 43, 1: *strenuus militiae*[12]).

Ann. 4, 5, 1: *rostratae naves*. Compared by Furneaux to Epod. 4, 18: *ora navium rostrata*. With no great cogency, since the phrase occurs in Cicero (De invent. 1, 32) and Suetonius (JC 63), thus eliminating the need for Nipperdey's alteration of *rostratae* to *constratae* in the Tacitean passage[13]).

Ann. 4, 16, 3: *penes incuriam*. The only example of *penes* with an impersonal object given by the dictionaries. Horace (AP 71) furnishes a model in *usus quem penes*.

Ann. 4, 60, 3: *falsum renidens*. The closest parallel is Odes 3, 27, 67: *perfidum ridens*. Cf. Odes 2, 19, 6: *turbidum laetatur*.

---

[7]) A. Draeger, Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus (Leipzig, 1882), 105.

[8]) I am inclined to think they are ablatives; Tacitus has a well-known fondness for such brief types. Also, in respect of the passage adduced from the Agricola, *firmus* with a dative would (as Ogilvie-Richmond point out) yield another sense.

[9]) This is the one quoted by Syme, Tacitus, 357.

[10]) Assuming that it is a genitive; earlier commentators on Horace (e. g. Orelli) explained *militiae* as a locative or a dative.

[11]) A turn of phrase anticipated by Velleius 1, 3, 1: *acer belli iuvenis*.

[12]) Cf. Draeger, 71.

[13]) Similarly, Bentley's *aera* for *ora* in the Horace passage ignores the *prora rostrata* of Pliny, NH 9, 30, 49.

Ann. 6, 14, 3: *custodes additi*. Furneaux oddly claims a reminiscence of Odes 3, 4, 78/79: *nequitiae additus/custos*. But the phrase is natural enough and parallels from Plautus on are easy to amass[14]).

Ann. 11, 15, 2: *laeta quidem in praesens*. Probably (as Furneaux thought) inspired by the *laetus in praesens* of Odes 2, 16, 25.

Ann. 12, 4, 1: *ingruentiumque dominationum provisor*. The last word is used in the sense of "foreseer", which employment is claimed as unique by Furneaux. It could be a conscious extension of its meaning of "provider" in AP 164, the only other literary text exhibiting this noun.

Ann. 12, 45, 6: *bello absterruisset*. The simple ablative with this verb was taken by Furneaux to derive from Serm. 1, 4, 129: *absterrent vitiis*. Fletcher[15]) pointed out an example of the usage from Pliny, NH 8, 47. In point of fact, it is as old as the comedian Titinius (Nonius 95, 1). Tacitus may actually have been influenced by Lucan 5, 129: *absterrere ducem noscendi ardore futura*. That, in turn, could boil down to Horatian influence at second hand, for in the preceding lines Lucan has the phrase *errore vagam curisque vacantem*, recalling Odes 1, 22, 10/11: *ultra / terminum curis vagor expeditis*.

Ann. 12, 57, 5: *incusat cupidinis ac praedarum*. Furneaux claimed a Tacitean monopoly for *cupido* in the sense of "covetousness". Fletcher, giving no precise reference, called the usage Horatian. Odes 2, 16, 15 and Ep. 1, 1, 33 fit the bill. But the usage is so natural and common (as the dictionaries confirm) that it is doubtful whether any precise model for Tacitus need be sought.

Ann. 13, 3, 7: *et aliquando carminibus pangendis inesse sibi elementa doctrinae ostendebat*. Cf. Ann. 14, 16, 1: *carminum quoque studium adfectavit, contractis quibus aliqua pangendi facultas ...* although *pango* is quite frequently used of the writing of poetry, the caustic tone of these passages makes it at least possible that he had in mind the sarcastic Ep. 1, 18, 40 (*nec, cum venari volet ille, poemata panges*) and AP 416 (*ego mira poemata pango*).

Ann. 13, 15, 2: *regnum lusu sortientium* (of Nero as the *rex bibendi*). Cf. Odes 1, 4, 18: *nec regna vini sortiere talis*.

Ann. 14, 27, 4: *numerus magis quam colonia*. Cf. Agric. 34, 2: *reliquus est numerus ignavorum*; Hist. 4, 15, 3: *segnem numerum*. This contemptuous use[16]) of *numerus* was linked by Furneaux to

[14]) See Fletcher, 32/33, and commentators on the Odes for examples.

[15]) Fletcher, 39 (also correcting Furneaux's false references to Horace).

[16]) Originally a Graecism; cf. Euripides, Heracl. 997.

Ep. 1, 2, 27: *nos numerus sumus et fruges consumere nati.* Horatian influence cannot be guaranteed, since Furneaux overlooked Cassius in Cicero, Ad. fam. 12, 13, 4: *Graecorum militum numero speciem exercitus effecit.* However, it may be rendered more plausible by the humorous *eademque de causa minus frugum et plures qui consumerent* of Hist. 4, 26, 6, not far from the *segnem numerum* passage adduced above and clearly recalling the balance of Horace's line.

Ann. 15, 24, 1: *super optinenda Armenia.* Furneaux seems justified in tracing this use of *super* with the gerundial ablative back to Carmen Saeculare 18: *super iugandis feminis.*

Ann. 15, 37, 8: *ex illo contaminatorum grege.* An evident reminiscence (as Draeger and Furneaux divined) of Odes 1, 37, 9: *contaminato cum grege turpium* (eunuchs are meant in both passages).

Ann. 15, 52, 4: *alio sui muneris rem publicam faceret.* According to Furneaux, this may show a trace of Odes 4, 3, 21: *totum muneris hoc tui est.* But the influence (cf. Ann. 14, 55, 1: *id primum tui muneris habeo*) could just as well be Ovid, Trist. 1, 6, 6: *si quid ego adhuc sum, muneris omne tui est.*

Ann. 15, 63, 5: *corpus ... tenuatum.* Just possibly coloured by the *tenuatum corpus* of Serm. 2, 2, 84.

Hist. 1, 7, 2: *caedes sinistre accepta.* The adverb, described by Goelzer as "rare et poetique", can be observed in AP 452 in an analogous phrase: *exceptumque sinistre.* However, as pointed out by Fletcher, one must not forget the *porro non tam sinistre constitutum* of Pliny, Pan. 45, 5. Nevertheless, a degree of Horatian influence might be presumed on one, if not both, of the two authors.

Hist. 1, 13, 3: *pueritiam egerat.* Fletcher adduced *actae pueritiae* from Odes 1, 36, 8.

Agric. 15, 2: *aeque ... aeque.* This iteration is commonly supposed to be modelled on Ep. 1, 1, 25: *aeque pauperibus prodest, locupletibus aeque.* The claim may be enhanced by two other possible indications of Horace in the same passage, hitherto not adduced. First, the *aeque ... aeque* clause contrasts *discordiam* and *concordiam.* That evokes the *concordia discors* of Ep. 1, 12, 19. Then, two sentences later, we have the bitter epigram *tamquam mori tantum pro patria nescientibus.* Conceivably a parody of the celebrated *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.*

Agric. 40, 4: *otium hausit.* Apparently a unique phrase. Editors are in the habit of comparing *libertatem haurire* (Hist. 4, 5, 2; Livy 39, 26, 7). However, it might be a conscious variant on the Horatian *laborem haurire* in Serm. 1, 2, 78/79: *unde laboris / plus*

haurire mali est. This notion gains currency from the fact that Tacitus has a very close parallel to the latter in Hist. 3, 84, 1: *quidquid laboris et periculi hausissent.*

Agric. 41, 2: *quae sileri Agricolam non sinerent.* For this use of *sileo*, Furneaux cites Odes 1, 12, 21: *neque te silebo.* More pertinent might be Odes 4, 9, 30/31: *non ego te meis / chartis inornatum silebo*; the finale of the Agricola bears a general resemblance in terms of sentiment to lines 25—28 of the Lollius Ode[17]). Cp. also Odes 4, 8, 21: *si chartae sileant quod bene feceris.*

Germ. 4, 2: *truces et caerulei oculi.* Something of a commonplace, of course; one recalls Juvenal 13, 164: *caerula quis stupuit Germani lumina.* Still, Tacitus may have had in mind Epod. 16, 7: *nec fera caerulea domuit Germania pube*, with *truces* as a variant on *fera.*

Germ. 29, 4: *inopia audax.* Arguably a reminiscence of the Horatian *paupertas audax* (Ep. 2, 2, 51).

Germ. 40, 2: *castum nemus.* Just possibly influenced by Odes 1, 12, 59: *parum castis ... lucis.*

The foregoing analysis has weakened, if not eliminated, some alleged Horatian echoes; others have been enhanced; and some new ones put forward for consideration. Although relatively few can be maintained with certainty, the cumulative effect is suggestive. Altogether, then, a limited but not unfruitful harvest.

It is notorious that Horace predicted a future as a school text for his work (Ep. 1, 20, 17/18; cf. Serm. 1, 10, 75). All the evidences converge to demonstrate the fulfilment of his prophecy. That he was bracketed with Virgil is evident from Petronius, Sat. 118, 5: *Homerus testis et lyrici Romanusque Vergilius et Horatii curiosa felicitas*; Quintilian 1, 8, 5/6: *optime institutum est ut ab Homero et Virgilio lectio inciperet ... alunt et lyrici ... nam et Graeci licenter multa, et Horatium in quibusdam nolim interpretari*; Juvenal 7, 226/27: *cum totus decolor esset / Flaccus et haereret nigro fuligo Maroni.* Suetonius included him amongst his literary biographies. Even the so-called archaists of the Antonine period did not overlook him. Aulus Gellius names him once (NA 2, 22, 25; cf. 2, 22, 2),

---

[17]) For some possible concordances of theme here and elsewhere, cf. A. Treloar in Essays Presented to Francis Letters (ed. M. N. Kelly, Melbourne, 1966), 193—198. One might add Ann. 2, 88, 4 and 3, 55, 6, where Tacitus inveighs against indiscriminate praise of the past, given the Horatian sentiments expressed in Ep. 2, 2, 18f.

whilst for Fronto he was *memorabilis poeta*[18]). His parity with Virgil in the curriculum was still alive in the fourth century, on the showing of Ausonius 4, 55/56: *te praeunte, nepos, modulata poemata Flacci | altisonumque iterum fas est didicisse Maronem.*

All of which confirms the judgement of Aper in the Dialogus. It is hard to believe that Tacitus did not take his own advice. True, one does not always relish one's school texts in later life. But a poet adjudged by Quintilian (10, 1, 96) to be *lyricorum fere solus legi dignus ... et varius figuris et verbis felicissime audax* was surely congenial to the historian who was himself to be most noted for linguistic audacity and *variatio*.

---

[18]) Ad M. Caes. 1, 8, 5; elsewhere, Fronto several times quotes from or alludes to Horace. It is piquant to observe that Marcus Aurelius came to be something of an odd man out, observing (Ad M. Caes. 2, 10, 3): *rogo ne Horatii memineris qui mihi cum Polione est emortuus.* But at least he had read the poet!

XLIV

WOMEN IN TACITUS

Hinc ad capessendos magistratus in urbem degressus Domitiam Decidianam, splendidis natalibus ortam, sibi iunxit: idque matrimonium ad maiora nitenti decus ac robur fuit. vixeruntque mira concordia, per mutuam caritatem et in vicem se anteponendo, nisi quod in bona uxore tanto maior laus, quanto in mala plus culpae est.[1]

Of course, Tacitus' mother-in-law was still alive when these words were penned.[2] A modern cynic might think the compliments tainted by tact: *de socru nil nisi bonum.* But that jest fails in a Roman context. It was the *noverca*, not the *socrus*, who was the butt of low male humour; Tacitus cheerfully conformed to this music hall standard.[3] And in no age is it impossible for a man to love his mother-in-law. Sincerity is not to be automatically excluded from the panegyric of Tacitus.

Which is not to eject comic possibilities. The concluding epigram in this vignette of Agricola's connubial bliss is palpable enough. It will summon Juvenal to mind, but is quite predictable from a moralising historian of old-fashioned outlook. Subtler humour may repose in the phrase *vixeruntque mira concordia.* The sentiment is that of formal epitaph, a source earlier drawn upon by Tacitus when he attributed *rarae castitatis* to Agricola's mother.[4] The language of epitaph was an obvious technical aid to the composition of the *Agricola.*[5] Yet the epithets *mira* and *rarae* suggest sardonic reflection on the manners of the age, if not on women as a sex.

The passage under discussion is a pointer to the Tacitean stereotype of the ideal woman, in its omissions as much as its contents. The lady will be married, of benefit to her husband's career through family and character alike. She is chaste and loyal; the second virtue will be especially invoked if her husband is exiled or executed. She is entitled to husbandly consideration, but the onus is on her to demonstrate that she is deserving of this.

Agricola acquired his wife as a necessary stage in the *cursus honorum.* The reader has to recall for himself that Agricola was only in his early twenties when he married Domitia; her age is not disclosed. Tacitus himself was not much older when he contracted with Agricola's thirteen-year old daughter. Again, the bride's age is not formally mentioned, nor even her name.[6] To a Roman, such youthful alliances were unsurprising. Tacitus' mode of allusion does not amount to deliberate exclusion of the romantic. Also pertinent is

the absence of physical description. This again conforms to the practice of epitaph.[7] One would naturally like to know if the mother, wife, and daughter of Agricola had any physical charms. If the first two had not, the cynic might quote *casta est quam nemo rogavit*[8] and more readily accept their claims to chastity and fidelity. And there would be closer scrutiny of Tacitus' vague description of his young bride (or fiancée) as *egregiae tum spei.* True, one might think only Humbert Humbert could find much to expatiate on in a thirteen year old girl. But the younger Pliny exhibits no shortage of precise praises in his account of the daughter of Minicius Fundanus, dead just before her thirteenth year.[9] It will be seen that Tacitus was not indifferent to female beauty, nor totally unwilling to write about it,[10] but it tends to emerge as a suspicious, or at least dangerous, quality.

Syme, who rightly denies that Tacitus despised women,[11] observed that 'for Tacitus virtue in women consists not merely in *pudicitia* but in *constantia* and *fides.*'[12] The comment is on the mark. The exordium to the *Histories* includes a generalising tribute: *comitatae profugos liberos matres, secutae maritos in exilia coniuges.*[13] The *Annals* record several such case histories. Not only such well-known ladies as the pathetic Antistia Pollitta, wife of Rubellius Plautus,[14] but lesser lights of the order of Artoria Flaccilla and Egnatia Maximilla.[15] Nor was there a shortage of women willing to die with their men. The familiar Arriatologies are supplemented in the *Annals.* Antistia Pollitta[16] shared a family suicide in 66 with her father Lucius Antistius Vetus and his mother-in-law Sextia. The harrowing account by Tacitus includes the detail that the ladies were *singulis vestibus ad verecundiam velati balneis inferuntur.*[17] Paxaea, wife of Pomponius Labeo, opened her veins along with her husband in 34;[18] so, at the same time, did Sextia, to encourage her spouse Mamercus Scaurus.[19]

Nor are such anecdotes confined to Roman ladies of distinction. Zenobia, wife of the fugitive Radamistus, is applauded for her courage in a romantic episode.[20] Though pregnant, she rode with him in desperate flight until exhausted. At her plea, Radamistus stabbed her, flung her into a river, and galloped on to his native Iberia. She was found, still alive, by some traditionally good shepherds, nursed back to health, and relayed to Artaxata and the kindly offices of Tiridates. Space was also promised in the *Histories*[21] for the astonishing tale of Epponina. She was the wife of the insurgent chieftain Julius Sabinus, and hid with him in the ruins of a country estate for almost the entire reign of Vespasian. The historian promised his readers more about the *insigne Epponinae*

uxoris exemplum; the anecdote would be continued *suo loco.* The epitomated version of Dio,[22] supplying exotic details and an unhappy ending, ensures that we have lost a fine passage.

Slave girls and freedwomen are honoured on occasion, affording welcome relief from the usual Tacitean distaste for their male counterparts. At this social level, however, a particular technique of allusion is notable. The bravest of Octavia's *ancillae* is commended for her bold retort to Tigellinus:[23] anonymously; it is left for Dio's epitomator to furnish (or fabricate) the name of Pythias.[24] Again, no reader of the *Annals* will lightly forget the courageous and dreadful doom of Epicharis,[25] the freedwoman involved in Piso's conspiracy. Less remembered is the way she is introduced into the plot with a reasonable question and a malicious comment: *incertum quonam modo sciscitata (neque illi ante ulla rerum honestarum cura fuerat).*[26] Tacitus does not admit an explanation tendered in another source: namely that she was the mistress of Annaeus Mela.[27] Not that such inconsistency of character portrayal is restricted to women. Faenius Rufus, for example, was introduced into the *Annals* with the stigma of *segnem innocentiam*;[28] he recurs with the accolade *vita famaque laudatum.*[29] But it is reasonable to suspect that Tacitus was not wildly enthusiastic in his tributes to women of inferior station. However, in all fairness, the case of Acte may soften this judgement. She is introduced as a harmless passion of Nero's: *muliercula nulla cuiusquam iniuria cupidines principis explente.*[30] We do not know if Tacitus brought her back to bury Nero in 68, as does Suetonius.[31] It is possible. The historian quite relished the theme of women burying their men. Piso's wife Verania helped to bury him in 69, and the obsequies of Titus Vinius were attended to at the same time by his daughter Crispina.[32] Acte was doomed to eventual sanctity as a Christian convert, a matter of faith rather than evidence.[33] If true, it would not have endeared her to Tacitus, and in any case she may owe her initial tribute to his need for dramatic contrast with Nero's mother and Poppaea.[34] Nevertheless, she is spared the malice accorded in the *Annals* to Epicharis, and might have been written up as an example of the quality of *constantia* in low station.

'Sex is not among the main preoccupations of Tacitus.' Thus Syme.[35] This is obviously true, especially when contrast is made with the lurid pages of Suetonius. Most notably so in the historian's refusal to dwell on the sexual foibles of emperors. Whether this rule was adhered to in the missing section on Caligula must remain a moot point. It is possible that Tacitus felt that certain things should not be said even about the worst of emperors. But the topic

is by no means excluded, and some Tacitean attitudes are discernible.

The problematic Livilla evoked a sweeping generalisation upon her seduction by Sejanus: *neque femina amissa pudicitia alia abnuerit.*[36] There is no attempt at understanding the personal problems and temptations facing a girl who *formae initio aetatis indecorae, mox pulchritudine praecellebat.* Beautiful women are rare in Tacitus, and vice is invariably concomitant with looks. Poppaea is the outstanding example. She is introduced with an unusually full description immediately after the account of the wild and fatal *affaire* between the tribune Octavius Sagitta and the adulterous Pontia,[37] and her *insignis impudicitia* is branded as *magnorum rei publicae malorum initium.* The portrayal of her merits extensive quotation: *huic mulieri cuncta alia fuere praeter honestum animum. quippe mater eius, aetatis suae feminas pulchritudine supergressa. gloriam pariter et formam dederat; opes claritudine generis sufficiebant. sermo comis nec absurdum ingenium: modestiam praeferre et lascivia uti. rarus in publicum egressus, idque velata parte oris, ne satiaret aspectum, vel quia sic decebat. famae numquam pepercit, maritos et adulteros non distinguens; neque adfectui suo aut alieno obnoxia, unde utilitas ostenderetur, illuc libidinem transferebat. igitur agentem eam in matrimonio Rufri Crispini equitis Romani, ex quo filium genuerat, Otho pellexit iuventa ac luxu et quia flagrantissimus in amicitia Neronis habebatur: nec mora quin adulterio matrimonium iungeretur.*[38]

In the *Histories*, Poppaea is sharply recalled as the *principale scortum.*[39] To the narrative of the *Annals*, she is a dramatic prop. Book 14 opens with her nagging Nero to get rid of Agrippina; its concluding tragedy is her role in the liquidation of Octavia. Poppaea stands in double contrast. She is the obvious antithesis to innocent little Octavia. More to the point, her alleged promiscuity recalls Messalina, and implies a contrast with the controlled appetites of Nero's mother, which had earlier been made in overt terms: *versa ex eo civitas et cuncta feminae oboediebant, non per lasciviam, ut Messalina, rebus Romanis inludenti. adductum et quasi virile servitium: palam severitas ac saepius superbia; nihil domi impudicum, nisi dominationi expediret.*[40]

With her beauty, charm, and intellect, Poppaea affords a welcome relief from the traditional wool-spinning, chaste *matrona univira,* now a firm part of the imperial moralisers' mythological Republic. It requires effort to recollect that Poppaea's promiscuity is unattested, and that she actually married the three men in her life. Moreover, Tacitus admits that both Nero and Otho genuinely loved her.[41] Perhaps they were besotted fools. But Tacitus, who

sought the female ideal in such women as Agricola's mother, a woman of rare chastity and aversion to philosophy (the latter trait shared with Nero's mother![42]), was not fitted to understand such matters.

Other women celebrated for looks or romance are adversely noted. The interesting Albucilla was prosecuted for *maiestas* in 37.[43] She tried to kill herself, failed, and was imprisoned by the senate. Some of her lovers were punished; others, including Domitius Ahenobarbus and Vibius Marsus, escaped for the moment. A comic note was added by the punishment of her very prosecutor, a fellow *truci eloquentia, promptus adversum insontis.* The lady herself is curtly dismissed without sympathy as *multorum amoribus famosa.* Calvina Junia, sister of L. Silanus, dubbed *festivissimam omnium puellarum* in the *Apocolocyntosis,*[44] is *sane decora et procax.*[45] Nicely enough, the wife of the conspirator Piso, one Satria Galla, is branded as *degenerem et sola corporis forma commendatam.*[46] It is possible that a kinder view was entertained of Berenice, who is lightly alluded to in the *Histories: florens aetate formaque et seni quoque Vespasiano magnificentia munerum grata.*[47]

Occasionally, there may be some suppression of these dangerous feminine qualities. For instance, there is no hint in the extant portion of the *Annals* of the beauty, wit, and capacity for survival of Statilia Messalina, mistress and last wife of Nero.[48] She was a second Poppaea in many respects, even to the extent of also having been loved by Otho.[49] True, there may have been a more detailed account of her in the narrative of Nero's last two years. However, Tacitus is hardly reticent as a rule on imperial ladies; Nero's mother and Poppaea were both accorded quite elaborate introductions.[50] In the case of Statilia, he may have curbed his comments out of deference to the memory of her previous husband, the consular Atticus Julius Vestinus, victim of Nero and of good repute in the *Annals.*

The foregoing examples do not prove unremitting misogyny on the historian's part. Handsome men are sometimes mentioned in fateful circumstances. Valeria Messalina had a pronounced taste for such; very understandable after poor Claudius. Silius was *iuventutis Romanae pulcherrimum;*[51] the hapless *eques* Traulus Montanus, with whom she consorted for one night, was *modesta iuventa, sed corpore insigni.*[52] In the very few precise allusions to physical traits, more is said of masculine deficiencies than womanly ones. The reader is regaled by the bald and pitted Tiberius, Burrus of the withered hand, and the twisted ex-cobbler Vatinius,[53] but where are the ugly ladies? Yet all this does not invalidate the general

impression that beauty and virtue are a combination rarely admitted by Tacitus.

Mercifully, this paraded disinterest in physical appearance does not lead Tacitus to expel romantic and colourful stories from his narratives. A pleasant one involved the wife of the legate Calvisius Sabinus: *uxor mala cupidine visendi situm castrorum, per noctem militari habitu ingressa, cum vigilias et cetera militiae munia eadem lascivia temptasset, in ipsis principiis stuprum ausa, et criminis huius reus Titus Vinius arguebatur.*[54] British readers will recall similar stories in their Sunday newspapers about teenage girls detected on American army bases. In this case, Tacitus appears more concerned by the social than the sexual improprieties. He is also pompous in his account of Petilius Cerealis, absent from his flagship when Germans attacked his camp and naval flotilla by night; the good commander was away in the arms of the Ubian Claudia Sacrata.[55] Of course, one cannot imagine Agricola in such an escapade! Too much is made of the affair of Vistilia, the woman of praetorian family who registered with the aediles as a common prostitute.[56] Tacitus prefaces his mention of this diverting detail with a generalisation of absurd solemnity: *eodem anno gravibus senatus decretis libido feminarum coercita cautumque ne quaestum corpore faceret cui avus aut pater aut maritus eques Romanus fuisset.* One really cannot believe in the likelihood of a collective rush by ladies of this class into a life of shame.

Such tales are not always inserted to provide scope for priggish comment and wild generalisation. The affair of the tribune Octavius Sagitta,[57] who murdered his adulterous mistress Pontia Postumia, has enormous 'human interest'. Octavius *amore vaecors* lured Pontia away from her husband with *ingentibus donis* and promise of marriage. She reciprocated the latter promise, but once divorced attempted to jilt him *spe ditioris coniugis.* However, she was willing to grant him one last favour: *noctem unam ad solacium, qua delenitus modum in posterum adhiberet.* On the appointed night, Octavius arrived with a freedman and a concealed dagger; Pontia was attended by a slave girl who knew what was going on. *Tum, ut adsolet in amore et ira, iurgia preces, exprobratio satisfactio; et pars tenebrarum libidini seposita; ex qua quasi incensus nihil metuentem ferro transverberat et adcurrentem ancillam vulnere absterret cubiculoque prorumpit.* Octavius was tried and condemned, despite an attempt by his freedman to shoulder the blame. Tacitus recalls the affair in the *Histories;*[58] the above narrative is furnished as dramatic introduction of a more fortunate *femme fatale*: Poppaea.

Or an anecdote may be useful for pointing up political machi-

nations. In the year 24, the praetor Plautius Silvanus *incertis causis* hurled his wife Apronia from a window.[59] Her father Lucius Apronius brought the matter before Tiberius. The emperor went to inspect the bedroom in question, and decided that the evidence of violent struggle refuted the husband's claim that he had been asleep and that Apronia must have committed suicide. The mystery was referred to a senatorial hearing. But a dagger was sent to poor Plautius by his sinister grandmother Urgulania, the confidante of Livia.[60] Taking this to be a hint from Tiberius, the accused tried to stab himself. He failed, and had his veins opened instead. The intrusion of the potent Urgulania is compounded by the last act in the tragedy. Plautius' first wife Numantina was tried and acquitted on the charge of having driven him mad by spells and drugs.

Tacitus composed such stories with elegance and black humour. On the theme of sex and its physical details, he is leering and periphrastic. The elaborate mention of the nocturnal orgy arranged for Nero by Tigellinus,[61] dramatically posited just before the fire of Rome, is packed with lubricious hints of naked women and homosexual lusts. Space is found in the *Histories*[62] for the morbid detail of prostitutes plying their trade alongside bloody corpses in the carnage of conflict in Rome between the Flavian and Vitellian partisans. Incidents of incest are retailed with relish and credulity; not only at the imperial level between Nero and his mother,[63] but in a senatorial home of consular status.[64] Again, the leer and covert innuendo are the techniques invoked.[65] It is the same when infamous women are singled out. Silia, the intimate of Petronius, blamed by Nero for revealing the secrets of the royal boudoir to the *elegantiae arbiter,* is dubbed *ad omnem libidinem adscita.*[66] Her superior and enduring rival, not Poppaea or Statilia Messalina but Calvia Crispinilla, is awarded the status *magistra libidinum Neronis.*[67] Blunt language is not employed. Occasionally, the style imports effective comic relief; who could resist the case of the hapless *mulier in concubitu mariti fulmine exanimata*?[68]

Other stereotypes enhance. Female poisoners decorate the narrative of the *Annals:* the well-known and versatile Locusta is balanced by the earlier Martina, notorious in Syria and much bruited at the time of Germanicus' death. Lest anyone forget them, Tacitus takes care to introduce both twice over.[69] It was also inevitable that such imperial *novercae* as Livia and Agrippina be respectively suspected and accused of employing poisons to further political and personal ends.[70]

Pharmaceutical ladies are offset by the periodical introduction of Vestal Virgins. The rigours of exile in the case of C. Junius Silanus

were mitigated by Tiberius at the request of the victim's sister Torquata, who is billed as *priscae sanctimoniae virginem.*[71] The senior Vestal, one Vibidia, tried in vain to intercede for Messalina in the latter's final hours.[72] A lavish gift from Tiberius to Cornelia, a newly appointed Vestal, is noted without innuendo.[73] And space can be made in a narrative for the registering of Vestals' appointments and deceases.[74]

Women of all rank and nationality can achieve *constantia* and *fides,* if not always *pudicitia.* But they attain these pinnacles by putting off the natural weakness of their sex and emulating male virtues. Tacitus relished such trite phrases as *muliebribus lamentis* (inserted without taste or tact, some might feel, in the closing sentences of the *Agricola*[75]) or *muliebriter fremere.* The conceit is forced home in the otherwise moving account of Antistia Pollitta's vain efforts to move the heart of Nero:[76] *modo muliebri eiulatu, aliquando sexum egressa voce infensa clamitabat.*[77] And the virtue of the elder Agrippina reposed in her unfeminine qualities: *aequi impatiens, dominandi avida, virilibus curis feminarum vitia exuerat.*[78]

Dogmatic utterances of this stamp inevitably involve bias and inconsistency. The mother of Nero, in her last hours, clings to hope *facili feminarum credulitate ad gaudia.*[79] The allusion in itself may be a light one,[80] but is absurdly applied in this context. Agrippina was one of the least imaginable victims of naive credulity. An anonymous Ligurian women set a *praeclaro exemplo* of courage during the Othonian massacre at Albintimilium.[81] This was the occasion of the killing of Agricola's mother.[82] The latter is not mentioned in the narrative of the *Histories,* and the Ligurian woman naturally is omitted from the *Agricola.* The juggling of dramatic effects is patent. On the other hand, Triaria, wife of L. Vitellius, is branded *ultra feminam ferox* and castigated for haughty savagery for her part in the civil war of 69.[83] And Verulana Gratilla, caught on the Capitoline Hill during the siege of Sabinus, is implicitly criticised because *neque liberos neque propinquos sed bellum secuta.*[84]

Formal obituaries of women are normally eschewed by Tacitus, though a Livia or a Julia might receive a necrological sentence or so.[83] Admittedly, this is offset to a degree by the occasionally detailed introduction of a notoriety such as Poppaea. Hence, the best set piece on women is perhaps the account of the debate in Tiberius' reign on the propriety of provincial governors taking their wives with them.[86] Aulus Caecina Severus urged that wives should be left at home; he won little support from his audience, and his motion was lost to the opposing speech of Valerius Messalinus. The

debate bristles with epigrams and humour both overt and implied. Caecina opened by claiming a happy marriage. But he had spent forty years of service in various provinces, and had always left his wife at home. Absence perhaps made the heart grow fonder in his case. The couple had six children, presumably conceived on his returns home between appointments. Every father could sympathise with Caecina's implied desire to get away from such emphatic domesticity. However, his arguments are caustic and impersonal: *non imbecillum tantum et imparem laboribus sexum sed, si licentia adsit, saevum, ambitiosum, potestatis avidum; incedere inter milites, habere ad manum centuriones; praesedisse nuper feminam exercitio cohortium, decursu legionum. cogitarent ipsi quotiens repetundarum aliqui arguerentur plura uxoribus obiectari: his statim adhaerescere deterrimum quemque provincialium, ab his negotia suscipi, transigi; duorum egressus coli, duo esse praetoria, pervicacibus magis et impotentibus mulierum iussis quae Oppiis quondam aliisque legibus constrictae nunc vinclis exolutis domos, fora, iam et exercitus regerent.*

This choice repertoire of prejudices evoked loud dissent, and Valerius Messalinus rose to offer rebuttal. Although possessing only *imago paternae facundiae,* he carried the day. Yet he ventured little defence of women, but imitates Caecina with such phrases as *sexum natura invalidum.* His comment *viri in eo culpam si femina modum excedat* will not have gone down well with all his listeners. Messallinus argued along pragmatic lines. It was better to take women along, to keep an eye on them and shield them from the temptations to which the frailty of their sex rendered them so vulnerable.

The construction of the debate recalls that between Cleon and Diodotus in Thucydides. There is an agreed theme; the seemingly inferior orator carries the day by concentrating his argument on practicalities. Caecina's speech echoes episodes involving women retailed elsewhere in Tacitus.[87] Tacitus must greatly have enjoyed writing up this debate. But it was as well that Caecina failed to convince his audience. For it is possible that Tacitus himself had taken his wife with him to a provincial appointment under Domitian![88]

It need hardly be observed that Tacitus exhibits no unique attitude towards women. Juvenal is never far from one's mind; Martial summed up the qualities of a woman of literary and philosophic pretensions with the line *non tam femineum nec populare sapit.*[89] More illuminating may be the views and experiences of the younger Pliny. Most married men will discuss their wives with male friends on some occasion. Both men hunted,[90] and it would be nice

to imagine the two chatting about their 'golf widows' in the field. The ultimate fate of Tacitus' wife is unknown: there has been speculation about divorce or death in childbirth.[91] The latter would have been a tragically common fate. Pliny, who longed for children, would have been the right man for sympathetic understanding. After two childless marriages (and probably twice a widower[92]), he saw his third wife Calpurnia almost die after a miscarriage.[93] One cannot say if Tacitus had children. None are mentioned in the *Agricola,* but, given the historian's reticence on personal matters, this is not conclusive. Whether he wanted any is quite another matter. The set piece on education in the *Dialogus*[94] (assuming the work to be by Tacitus) might imply a serious concern for bringing up children of his own, but the theme is too commonplace to prove anything. And it is not too cynical to recall that there were social reasons for wanting children as well as emotional ones. Roman fathers, like many modern ones, regarded the siring of a son as the final proof of their masculinity. Also, children, again especially a son, might, in the event of the father deceasing first, serve to discourage *captatores* who preyed on childless widows. *Captatio* was more than a satirist's cliché. Pliny had a host of stories about Aquilius Regulus in this context;[95] one of his intended dupes was Verania, widow of the Piso adopted by Galba, mentioned by Tacitus in the *Histories* as a loyal widow.

On a lighter note, did Tacitus ever confide whether the daughter of Agricola had lived up to her *egregiae spei?* Another unanswerable question. For his part, the uxorious Pliny was not in the least reticent about his Calpurnia. Admittedly, his most stirring tributes are contained in a letter to her relative Calpurnia Hispulla,[96] and she was a model wife for a kindly but vain husband. A catalogue of her virtues is rounded off with the unctuous conclusion: *ergo tibi gratias agimus, ego quod illam mihi, illa quod me sibi dederis.*[97] But Pliny had had his share of domestic grief, and should not be grudged some happiness.

Women are quite a favourite topic of Pliny. And not only that 'tedious pair',[98] the younger Arria and Fannia. Syme draws attention to the dearth of literary ladies in Pliny's circle.[99] An exception to the rule may be the wife of Pompeius Saturninus, who credited her with the verses and prose pieces passing under his name.[100] It was perfectly respectable for a lady to be lettered: Pliny's Calpurnia and the ill-fated young daughter of Fundanus are familiar examples. Less proper was feminine interest in mimes or board games. These pastimes are mentioned in his obituary of the aged Ummidia Quadratilla as the product of *feminam in illo otio*

sexus.[101] Wives in Pliny are expected to be *singularis exempli, severitatis exemplum,* and *omnis secreti capacissima.*[102] Pliny, no less than Tacitus, cherished his stereotypes. Bad as well as good. His account of his court appearance for the Baetici against their corrupt former governor, Caecilius Classicus, makes it clear that the culprit's wife was fairly suspected of complicity in his extortions, but proof was lacking.[103] Shades of the dire warnings of Caecina in Tacitus! By contrast, Classicus' daughter, also suspected, was cleared. Pliny was no stranger to litigious women. He was prepared to defend the lady Corellia against the consul-designate Caecilius, commenting that the affair was *nova lis fortasse ut feminae intenditur.*[104] He successfully defended, in trial and re-trial, some freedmen accused by a mother of poisoning her son.[105] One cannot visualise Tacitus waxing eloquent in defence of *liberti.* In his province, Pliny became involved in the case of Flavius Archippus, a man under legal attack from one Furia Prima. Pliny sent the relevant petitions from both parties to Trajan; neither man expresses surprise or scorn at the spectacle of a litigious lady,[106] even though she would have been a rare phenomenon in the capital.

Two male friends are not obliged to agree on the subject of women. Pliny may perhaps have been more tolerant and understanding of them than the historian. Tacitus is often much closer to Juvenal and Martial in his comments and vignettes. Not that this speculative contrast should be pushed very far. Pliny may well have agreed that the Julio-Claudian gallery contained a monstrous regiment of women. After all, it was not only Tacitus who said so, nor just a Juvenal with his rehashings of old gossip about Messalina and company. There were the writings of Fannius and Titinius Capito on the victims of Nero to furnish the 'evidence' and sustain the picture.[107]

Nor is there reason to deny that Tacitus could have found ladies of his own age conforming to his ideal. The notion is only partly handicapped by our limited knowledge of the *Histories.* There are not many notable females in the extant portion. Those who appear are a mixed bag; evil does not predominate. We have already witnessed the valiant Epponia, the bold Ligurian lady, the loyal relatives of Piso and Titus Vinius, and the generalising tribute to the sex. There is even an imperial lady of some merit: Galeria Fundana.[108] Some will want to add the prophetic Veleda.[109] This gallery offsets more typical females of the ilk of Calvia Crispinilla, Triaria, and the wife of Calvisius Sabinus.

Syme notes of the *Annals:* 'there is much more about women in in the third hexad than in the first: the history had changed, not

the views of the historian'.[110] The first part of this claim requires modification, if only to support the second. As a matter of fact, women abound in the first hexad. Until her death and obituary notice, Livia lurks in the background: a constant and sinister presence. As noted before, she fulfils the role of the archetypal wicked *noverca*. In this, she is designed to anticipate the other monstrous dowager of the *Annals:* the younger Agrippina. Tacitus ensures the comparison by applying the formula of *muliebris inpotentia* to both.[111] Livia, understandably in what was largely a man's world, tended to cultivate a network of female confidantes. Of these, Urgulania was the most notorious. The line stretched back to before the death of Augustus. Consider only the enigmatic Marcia, wife of Fabius Maximus, who had been Augustus' only companion on his discreet visit to Agrippa Postumus on Planasia. Maximus blabbed to Marcia, who promptly went to Livia with the story.[112] Maximus was soon dead, perhaps by his own hand. Tacitus retails this story in the context of gossip concerning Livia's possible role in Augustus' death. Livia has to be placed in violent opposition to the virtuous wife of Germanicus.[113] But this picture is finally spoiled when Tacitus virtually admits after her decease, that Livia had been protecting her rival against Tiberius.[114] Little wonder that Tiberius, in his letter to the senate curtailing Livia's posthumous honours and deification, *increpuit amicitias muliebris.*[115] Or that he singled out the consular Fufius Geminus for especial criticism in the context. Fufius had risen *gratia Augustae,* and was *aptus adliciendis feminarum animis.* And some years later, Fufius' old mother Vitia was executed for bewailing his death.[116] This pattern of events is somewhat blurred by a Tacitean epigram prefacing the doom of Vitia: *ne feminae quidem exsortes periculi. quia occupandae rei publicae argui non poterant, ob lacrimas incusabantur.*

Tiberius' reign lacked an imperial wife to play the part of a Messalina or Poppaea. Julia might have filled this role, had her destiny been different. Tacitus records her death in exile without sympathy[117] (he goes so far as to add the comment that she had scorned Tiberius as *inparem* during their marriage), and revived tales of her adulteries more than once.[118] Not that the reign lacked ladies of suitable criminality. Plancina, wife of Germanicus' enemy Piso and a creature of Livia,[119] was to hand. Tacitus squeezed the maximum of dramatic effect out of his necrology: *ceterum Agrippinae pernicies, quod vix credibile, Plancinam traxit. nupta olim Cn. Pisoni et palam laeta morte Germanici, cum Piso caderet, precibus Augustae nec minus inimicitiis Agrippinae defensa erat. ut odium et gratia desiere, ius valuit; petitaque criminibus haud ignotis*

sua manu sera magis quam immerita supplicia persolvit.[120]

Missing portions of the *Annals* may well conceal or reduce the roles of certain other women. One expects for easy example, that there must have been more about poor Livilla. After all, her doom seems to have attracted no less than forty-four speeches in the senate,[121] and as late as 34 action was still being taken against her paramours.[122] It has already been seen that Tacitus made no effort to allow for the difficulties of an ugly duckling turned beauty, a girl expected to emulate the virtues of her brother Germanicus and mother Antonia, married to an unattractive imperial husband, and easy prey to the efficient blandishments of a Sejanus. It needs to be remembered that the evidence for her complicity in the murder of Drusus was furnished by Apicata, the divorced wife of Sejanus and mother of his three children, and confirmed under torture by Livilla's doctor Eudemus and the eunuch Lygdus, a favourite eunuch of Drusus.[123] Some evidence![124] In fine, the story of Livilla and Sejanus (who promised her marriage and *consortium regni)*[125] is to some extent a doublet of the forthcoming tale of Messalina and Silius. A similar story began to develop in 37 when Ennia, wife of the prefect Macro, was suborned by her husband into enticing the impressionable Caligula into a sexual liaison with political prospects.[126] Another recurrent detail is the role of jealous women who provide evidence to convict their female rivals. Just as Apicata procured the doom of Livilla, so Messalina was denounced to Claudius by two imperial concubines, Calpurnia and Cleopatra.[127] And it is not impossible that the above themes were developed by Tacitus in the lost account of Caligula's reign around that emperor's *femme fatale* Caesonia.

Reverting to the first hexad, one finds a gallery of women involved in *maiestas* and other trials under Tiberius. Only one is named (in the extant portion of the *Annals)* as having been executed. That was Vitia, a special case already discussed. Exiled for *maiestas* were Aemilia Lepida, Sosia Galla, Claudia Pulchra, Pompeia Macrina, Sancia, and of course Agrippina.[128] There was also Albucilla, already discussed, and the obscure Acutia whose offences and precise fate are not given.[129] A certain pattern is revealed by study of these cases. The women in question tend to be charged with several offences, of which adultery and slander of Tiberius and his family are the commonest.[130] Tacitus elected to write up the case of Aemilia Lepida for several dramatic reasons. She could trace her ancestry back to Sulla and Pompey; her case was brought by her ex-husband and defended by her brother; the attitude of Tiberius was particularly inscrutable; she attracted the sympathy of the mob,

although *infami ac nocenti*. Sosia Galla and Claudia Pulchra came to grief because of their intimacy with Agrippina. Sancia and Pompeia Macrina fell because the emperor was liquidating their male relatives. Acutia had been the wife of Publius Vitellius, and the infamous Albucilla had had some eminent lovers. One further case enhances these recurrent patterns: that of Appuleia Varilla.[131] She was acquitted of defaming the royal family, but convicted of the supplementary charge of adultery and banished two hundred miles from the capital. It may also be remarked that few women committed suicide to escape their punishments. Again, the recorded cases conform to patterns. Women either die virtuously by their own hands to demonstrate *constantia* and *fides* to their husbands; such cases were those of Sextia and Paxaea.[132] Or they were creatures both nefarious and guilty, like Plancina and another Aemilia Lepida[133] (once married to young Drusus).

Maiestas and associated charges were not the only perils facing woman. Tiberius insisted on a severe banishment for the adulterous Aquilia.[134] Drusus intervened in 21 to imprison the splendidly truculent Annia Rufilla, who was abusing the junior senator Cestius Gallus *in foro, in limine curiae;* he had had her convicted of an unspecified fraud.[135] Then there was the incestuous mother of Sextus Papinius who had driven her son to suicide.[136] And Numantina should not be forgotten, prosecuted but acquitted for administering spells against her former husband Plautius Silvanus who had hurled his present wife from a window.[137]

The personality and experiences of Tiberius may have made him especially malignant against women. Tacitus does not lay down any general principle. Sex, love, and politics were often intertwined in cases involving women, imperial or otherwise. Things were rather different in the second and third hexads. The uxorious Claudius ensured a surfeit of imperial ladies. Tacitus held no brief for Messalina or Agrippina. The former was only twenty-four at her death. Her nature and the physique of Claudius made her very susceptible to men of handsome appearance, as has been seen. Tacitus exhibits no more understanding of this than of the situation of Livilla. It was left for the author of the *Apocolocyntosis* to list Messalina as an innocent victim of the reign.[138] That malicious pasquinade also lists two Julias as victims of Claudius; Tacitus and Dio assigned both their fates to the connivings of Messalina.[134] Women who came to grief under Claudius and Nero were relatively few, usually bad characters, and owed their doom to the machinations of more potent females. Nero's aunt, for instance, Domitia Lepida had an *infensa aemulatio* with his mother.[140] The mother of

Messalina was destroyed by Agrippina *muliebribus causis*; the two were similar in everything.[141] Junia Silana was no better than Nero's mother either.[142] And so on.

The tragic Octavia will not be easily forgotten or her fate excused, and women driven to demonstrate their *constantia* under Nero have already been documented. But the sparing of Seneca's wife and Lucan's mother (the latter in spite of Tacitus' *sine absolutione, sine supplicio dissimulata*)[143] does something to redress the balance. As does the absence of *maiestas* trials involving women; and perhaps such details as the survival of Acte, whose face can never have been welcome to Poppaea.

Some tentative conclusions may be ventured. Tacitus acknowledged the importance of women in the politics and society of the early Empire. It was best if they exhibited the traditional virtues of the Republic. By chance or tactful distortion, these qualities were paramount in the mother, wife, and daughter of Agricola. They are not easily discovered in the Julio-Claudian women, but could be detected in the next epoch. Servile and foreign women might also attain them. Physical beauty was not something to be expatiated over; it was best treated in general terms, with innuendo and suspicion. There were distinctive feminine traits, such as credulity or a propensity to tears and jealousies, which ought to have set them off from men. In fact, they did not. A woman might equal a man in virtue and vice. She could plot and kill, turn her sex to advantage or suppress it, be chaste or immoral, brave or cowardly.

Lacking evidence, one must resist probing too glibly into Tacitus' psychology. It can, however, be suggested without much trepidation that his attitudes were conditioned by his own personality and experiences, by what he had read in his sources, by his knowledge of Pliny and the latter's female acquaintances, and by his weakness for the satirical techniques of a Juvenal.

No one could visualise Cornelius Tacitus as a supporter of Women's Liberation; more to the point, he was no unremitting 'male chauvinist pig'. On women, he is sometimes silly, frequently dogmatic, often inconsistent. All of which is very male, human and credible.

1. *Agr.* 6.
2. *Agr.* 46.
3. *Ann.* 1.10: *Livia gravis in rem publicam mater, gravis domui Caesarum noverca;* 12.44: (Radamistus) *novercae odiis impar;* 12.65: *at novercae insidiis domum omnem convelli.* These examples could be multiplied; see Gerber-Greef, *Lexicon Taciteum*, s.v. *noverca.*
4. *Agr.* 4.
5. See R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (1962), 280 f., esp. 296-7.
6. *Agr.* 9.
7. Lattimore, 294, 297.
8. Ovid, *Amores* 1.8.43.
9. *Ep.* 5, 16.
10. See R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 343.
11. Syme, 534.
12. Syme, 535, n.2.
13. *Hist.* 1.3.
14. *Ann.* 14.22.
15. *Ann.* 15.71: *Priscum Artoria Flaccilla coniunx comitata est, Gallum Egnatia Maximilla, magnis primum et integris opibus, post ademptis: quae utraque gloriam eius auxere.*
16. See I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (1965), 129,171, for the significance of her name as a term of endearment. For this reason, perhaps, Juvenal, 2.68, lists a Pollitta in a gallery of infamous ladies.
17. *Ann.* 16.10-11.
18. *Ann.* 6.29.
19. *Ann.* 6.29; see Syme, *Ten Studies in Tacitus* (1970), 68.
20. *Ann.* 12.51.
21. *Hist.* 4.67
22. 66.3.2; 66.16.1: two sons were born to the couple in their nine years of hiding; eventually all were captured, brought to Rome, and executed in 79. In this version, the lady's name is Peponila.
23. *Ann.* 14.60: *castiora esse muliebria Octaviae respondit quam os eius.*
24. 62.13.4.
25. *Ann.* 15.57.
26. *Ann.* 15.51.
27. Polyaenus, *Strat.* 8.62; see R. McMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (1966), 311.
28. *Ann.* 14.51.
29. *Ann.* 15.50; see my note of Seneca's *potentia* in *CP* 65 (1970), 187-8, on this Tacitean trick.
30. *Ann.* 13.12.
31. *Nero* 50.
32. *Hist.* 1.47.
33. See B.W. Henderson, *Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero* (1903), 61 f., 459; devotees of *Quo Vadis?* will recall the Christianised Acte!
34. *Ann.* 13.46; 14.2. See Syme, *Tacitus*, 376-7.
35. *Tacitus*, 543.

36. *Ann.* 4.3.
37. *Ann.* 13.44
38. *Ann.* 13.45.
39. *Hist.* 1.13.
40. *Ann.* 12.7.
41. *Ann.* 16.7; *Hist.* 1.78.
42. Suetonius, *Nero* 52.
43. *Ann.* 6.47-8.
44. *Apol.* '8.
45. *Ann.* 12.4.
46. *Ann.* 15.59.
47. *Hist.* 2.81; also see 2.2.
48. *Ann.* 15.68.
49. Suetonius, *Otho* 10; see the scholiast on Juvenal 6.434.
50. On this, see B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus* (1952), 46.
51. *Ann.* 11.12.
52. *Ann.* 11.36.
53. See Syme, 343, for the technique and examples.
54. *Hist.* 1.48.
55. *Hist.* 5.22.
56. *Ann.* 2.85; see Syme, 373-4.
57. *Ann.* 13.44.
58. *Hist.* 4.44.
59. *Ann.* 4.22.
60. *Ann.* 2.34 for her influence.
61. *Ann.* 15.37.
62. *Hist.* 3.83.
63. *Ann.* 14.2; Suetonius, *Nero* 28. Tacitus discusses the source discrepancies, but prefers to blame Agrippina rather than Nero.
64. *Ann.* 6.49: see Syme, 543.
65. Rather than the graphic details of Suetonius, *Nero* 28.
66. *Ann.* 16.20.
67. *Hist.* 1.73.
68. *Ann.* 14.12.
69. *Ann.* 12.66; 13.15 (Locusta). *Ann.* 2.74; 3.7 (Martina). For Locusta see my note in *CQ* 20 (1970), 364.
70. *Ann.* 1.3 (Livia); 12.66 (Agrippina).
71. *Ann.* 3.69.
72. *Ann.* 11.32-4.
73. *Ann.* 4.16.
74. *Ann.* 15.22.
75. *Agr.* 46.
76. *Ann.* 16.10.
77. It may be significant that *eiulatus* occurs only here in the extant portions of Tacitus.
78. *Ann.* 6.25.
79. *Ann.* 14.4.
80. Syme, 534.
81. *Hist.* 2.13.
82. *Agr.* 7.
83. *Hist.* 2.63; 3.77.

84. *Hist.* 3.69.
85. See Syme, *Ten Studies in Tacitus*, 79, on this.
86. *Ann.* 3.33-4.
87. E.g., *Hist.* 1.48.
88. Syme, *Tacitus*, 68, 535.
89. 7.69.6.
90. *Ep.* 1.6.3.
91. Syme, 542.
92. *Ep.* 10.2.2; see A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (1966), 559.
93. *Ep.* 8.10; 8.11.
94. *Dial.* 28 f.
95. *Ep.* 2.20.
96. *Ep.* 4.19.
97. See Sherwin-White, 296-7.
98. Sherwin-White, 243.
99. *Tacitus*, 537.
100. *Ep.* 1.16.6.
101. *Ep.* 7.24.5.
102. *Ep.* 3.1.5; 1.14.6; 1.12.7.
103. *Ep.* 3.9. 19-20; cf. Martial 2.56; Juvenal 8.128.
104. *Ep.* 4.17.11.
105. *Ep.* 7.6.8.
106. *Ep.* 10.59; 10.60.
107. *Ep.* 5.5; 1.17; 8.12.
108. *Hist.* 2.60; 2.64.
109. *Germ.* 8; *Hist.* 4.61,65; 5.22,24.
110. *Tacitus*, 537, n.2.
111. *Ann.* 1.4; 12.57.
112. *Ann.* 1.5.
113. *Ann.* 1.33
114. *Ann.* 5.3; see Syme, 306-8, esp. 308, n.2.
115. *Ann.* 5.2.
116. *Ann.* 6.10
117. *Ann.* 1.53.
118. *Ann.* 3.24; 4.44; 6.51.
119. *Ann.* 2.43.
120. *Ann.* 6.26.
121. *Ann.* 6.2.
122. *Ann.* 6.29.
123. *Ann.* 4.11.
124. See Dio 58.11.6.
125. *Ann.* 4.3.
126. *Ann.* 6.45.
127. *Ann.* 11.30.
128. *Ann.* 2.22-3; 4.19; 4.52; 6.18; 5.3, 6.25 (Agrippina).
129 *Ann.* 6.47.
130. See Walker, 260 f. for annotated tables of all cases.
131 *Ann.* 2.50.
132. *Ann.* 6.29.
133. *Ann.* 6.40.

134 *Ann.* 4.42.
135. *Ann.* 3.36.
136 *Ann.* 6.49.
137. *Ann.* 4.22.
138. See my article in *Phoenix* 18 (1964), 39-48, on the authorship and purpose of the piece.
139. *Ann.* 13.32; 14.63; Dio 60.8.5.
140. *Ann.* 13.19-21.
141. *Ann.* 12.64-5.
142. *Ann.* 13.19.
143. *Ann.* 15.71.

XLV

THREE NOTES ON TACITUS, *HISTORIES* I

I.2 *opus adgredior opimum casibus, atrox proeliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace saevum.*

Opimum is notorious: much printed, much suspected (1). Syme (2) flatly rejected it as (in his words) not plausible. So also Chilver, in a new commentary that bids fair to become standard (3). Largely because of Madvig. That scholar (4) (himself preferring *rapidum*) insisted that *opimus* is not used *sic simpliciter de copia.* According to Chilver, this contention has never been successfully challenged.

A dubious doctrine, in point of fact, nor one that would in any event impede Cornelius Tacitus, a writer notable for his bold use of words. *Opimus* is a flexible term. It is freely employed without limitation to agricultural or monetary wealth. Frequently, for instance, in the context of oratory: Cic. *Or.* 25 *opimum dictionis genus* (cf. *Pro Flacc.* 81);Gell. XVII 10 *opima facundia.* Also notable is Stat. *silv.* IV 6,65 *huic acies semper victor narrabat opimas.*

The Horatian *invidus alterius macrescit rebus opimis* (*ep.* I 2,57) confirms the generalising use (5). And this is how the adjective was later understood. A Latin gloss (6) explains the word as synonymous with *pinguis* and *copiosus.* The former is used metaphorically by Fronto (7): *laetam et pinguem fortunam portendi ... sed omne contra evenit.*

True, *opimus* is employed nowhere else by Tacitus (8). A fact that does not disqualify the reading here. The historian was wont to reserve words and effects for special occasions (9). Given the context, it is not extravagant to detect a mordant and oblique jest on the *spolia opima,* perhaps comporting a recollection of Horace's *opimus triumphus* (*Odes* IV 4,51) (10).

Finally, those who do not fancy *opimum* have ignored the artistic balance that the word achieves, both with the preceding *uberiorem securioremque materiam* (I 1) and, more palpably, the *non tamen adeo virtutum sterile saeculum* that opens the next sequence (I 3). A period rich in disasters, but not barren of good: the antithesis is pointed, and utterly Tacitean.

---

(1) The editions and commentaries of W. Heraeus (Leipzig, 1929), C. D. Fisher (OCT), E. Koestermann (Teubner), H. Goelzer (Budé), C. H. Moore (Loeb), and H. Huebner (Heidelburg, 1963) provide a representative sampling. G. B. A. Fletcher (*Annotations on Tacitus,* Brussells-Berchem 1964) eschews the matter.

(2) *Tacitus,* Oxford 1958, p. 146, n. 1, preferring (without argument) *rapidum* or *varium.*

(3) G. E. F. Chilver, *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus'* Histories *I and II,* Oxford 1979, pp. 38-9.

(4) *Adversaria Critica,* Copenhagen 1873, vol. II, p. 559.

(5) Cf. Lucretius I 728 *rebus opima bonis.*

(6) *CGL* (ed. Goetz) V 126, 32.

(7) 208, 21 (Van den Hout; 220 Naber), from his *De bello Parthico.*

(8) According to the *Lexicon Taciteum* of Gerber-Greef-John (Leipzig, 1890).

(9) Many examples in Syme, *op. cit.,* pp. 724-7; cf. F. R. D. Goodyear, *Tacitus,* Oxford 1970, pp. 35-42.

(10) If so, add this passage to B. Baldwin, *Possible Horatian Echoes in Tacitus,* « Wien. Stud. », 13 (1979), pp. 144-50.

Another celebrated crux. *Missa* is the reading of *M.* Many editors (11) prefer *omissa,* an idea of Lipsius to which Wölfflin (12) gave cogent support. It hardly needs to be said that an *o* could have fallen out between *statim* and *missa.* Not that this ever happened in such parallel case as *ann.* II 83 *quaedam statim omissa sunt; hist.* IV 37 *raptis temere armis ac statim omissis;* cf. *ann.* VI 36 *tum omissa Armenia.* Nor is the epigram unique to Tacitus. A possible influence is Velleius II 39 *Gallias saepe et affectavimus et omisimus.*

Tacitus does not appear elsewhere to have employed *mittere* for *omittere.* As earlier observed, uniqueness is not enough to invalidate a reading (13). In large measure, the meaning of the phrase remains unaffected. Or so say some commentators: that meaning has engendered debate in the past (14). On the reckoning of Macdonald, « Britain was completely conquered and straightway left to look after itself », *missa* might be seen as a substitute, not for *omissa,* but *dimissa,* a compound of requisite sense, one commonly replaced by the single verb: Liv. XXI 54 *praetorium missum;* XXVI 14 *misso convivio;* Caes. *bc* I 3 *misso senatu; HA, Max.* 26,6 *misso senatu* (15).

I.37 *septem a Neronis fine menses sunt, et iam plus rapuit Icelus quam quod Polycliti et Vatinii et Aegiali perdiderunt.*

At II 95 a very similar register, *nondum quartus a victoria mensis, et libertus Asiaticus Polyclitos Patrobios et vetera odiorum nomina aequabat,* justifies the plurals against Madvig's (16) suspicions. At issue here is the last of the unholy trinity. Helius, Tigellinus, and Egnatius have all been proposed instead of Aegialus, a name whose rarity (17) has induced misgivings. Few commentators (18) have noticed Vetulenus Aegialus, a freedman immortalised by Pliny (*NH* XIV 49) and Seneca (*ep.* 86,14) for his purchase of the estate of Scipio Africanus at Liternum. *Vix idem,* concluded Stein (*PIR*² A 117). But it might be. The fellow fits the bill: an opulent *libertus* of the Julio-Claudian era (19). At all events, the name can stand, and commentaries should take account of the possibility.

---

(11) Heraeus, Fisher, and Moore (to name but three); Goelzer, Koestermann, and Huebner (again, a sampling only) retain *missa.* Syme, *op. cit.,* p. 124, n. 8, and Chilver, *op. cit.,* p. 40, incline to the latter.

(12) E. Wölfflin, *Jahresberichte Tacitus,* « Philologus », 27 (1868), p. 119.

(13) The demands of rhythm may have been decisive; cf. the analyses of E. Norden, *Altgermanien,* Leipzig, 1934, p. 28; E. Löfstedt, *Vermischte Studien,* Lund 1936, p. 126.

(14) G. Macdonald, « Britannia perdomita ac statim omissa », « Journ. Rom. Stud. », 27 (1937), pp. 93-8; « Verbum non amplius addam », « Journ. Rom. Stud. », 29 (1939), pp. 5-27. For recapitulation of the debate, cf. Chilver, *loc. cit.*

(15) For the strong Livian influence on Tacitus, cf. Fletcher, *op. cit.* (not discussing the present problem).

(16) *Op. cit.,* p. 561 (not discussing the name in question here).

(17) Apart from the individual discussed below, there is no other case in *PIR*². Nor does any Aegialus feature in the indexes to *CIL* (observe, however, a female cognate in *CIL* VI 13078 (= *ILS* 8108), at Rome). For the later period, the first volume of *PLRE* discloses a medical man Aegialaus.

(18) He is unnoticed by Huebner and Chilver; absent also (as far as I can see) from Syme's *Tacitus.*

(19) Despite S. M. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic,* Oxford 1969, p. 109, Vetulenus Aegialus is firmly located in this period by Pliny (*in nostra aetate*) and by Seneca (whom she does not cite). There is no need to suppose with Chilver that he was dead by now. Not all of Nero's influential freedmen were. Galba notoriously protected and advanced Halotus (Suet.*Galb.* 15, 2); Epaphroditus survived until the reign of Domitian (Suet., *Dom.* 14, 4).

XLVI

APULEIUS, TACITUS AND CHRISTIANS

Collation of Apuleius, *Met.* IX 14 with Tacitus, *Ann.* XV 44 strongly suggests that the former is deliberately echoing the latter, thus furnishing evidence that Tacitus was read soon after his death, despite the usual contrary statements. Furthermore, Apuleius can clearly be seen to be alluding to Christians rather than Jews, a disclosure that may settle that perennial dispute amongst Apuleian scholars as to whom the novelist is satirising.

At *Met.* IX 14, Apuleius introduces that repository of evil, the baker's wife. Having catalogued her fleshly sins, he appends a condemnation of the creature's depraved monotheism:

> tunc spretis atque calcatis diuinis numinibus in uicem certae religionis mentita sacrilega praesumptione dei, quem praedicaret unicum, confictis obseruationibus uacuis fallens omnes homines et miserum maritum decipiens matutino mero et continuo stupro corpus manciparat.

There has been much debate over the years as to whether Apuleius intends criticism of Jews or Christians [1]. One of his most recent and influential commentators, J. G. Griffiths [2], leaves the matter largely open, albeit tilting (in his words) slightly in favour of the Christians. This hesitant preference is due to the suggestion of Marcel Simon [3] that the register of the woman's vices corresponds closely to that compiled by the Apostle Paul in his attack on pseudo-Christians in 1 *Cor.* 5, 11. However, in view of the notorious pagan reluctance to read the New

---

[1] A full bibliography of this issue is not intended here; cf. the references in subsequent notes to Griffiths, Herrmann, Simon, and Walsh, all of whom provide copious accounts of the literature.

[2] Both in his Commentary on Book XI of the *Metamorphoses*, Leiden 1975, pp. 345, 359, and his subsequent «Isis in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius», in *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, Groningen 1978, p. 153.

[3] «Apulée et le christianisme», *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*, Paris 1974, pp. 299-305.

Testament[4], this seems an improbable notion, certainly not one on which to base any conclusions.

It is to the cognate secular sources that we should go for evidence to support the view that Christianity is what Apuleius has in mind. The behaviour of the baker's wife is a burlesque of that attributed to the sect by the younger Pliny and Fronto[5]. She is *ebriosa*, drunk *matutino mero*; according to Fronto, Christians *ad epulas solemni die coeunt*, whereupon their *conuiuium caluit* with resultant *ebrietatis feruor*. In the more sober version of Pliny, members of the sect are *soliti stato die ante lucem conuenire... rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum*. The baker's wife is a *hostis pudicitiae* who debases herself *continuo stupro*; Fronto accuses the Christians *incestae libidinis* and *infandae cupiditatis*, practised under the concealment of *impudentibus tenebris*.

The correspondence between Apuleius and Fronto is more one of substance than language. The argument of this paper does not depend upon establishing any formal debt owed by either author to the other. What is striking is the similarity of treatment in these two contemporary African observers.

Now the famous description in Tacitus, *Ann.* XV 44. Long ago, L. Herrmann[6] noticed some affinity of language between this and the Apuleian sequence. However, with a caution uncharacteristic of that scholar[7], he merely pointed to a couple of words shared by both authors and moved on to other matters. Here are the relevant parts of the two passages, with identical, similar, or comparable words and phrases shown up by underlining:

> Tacitus: ...adfecit quos per *flagitia* inuisos uulgus Christianos appellabat... repressaque in praesens *exitiabilis* superstitio rursum erumpebat, *non modo* per Iudaeam, originem *eius mali, sed per* urbem etiam *quo cuncta* undique *atrocia* aut *pudenda confluunt* celebranturque.
>
> Apuleius: *Nec enim* uel unum *uitium nequissimae* illi feminae deerat, *sed omnia prorsus*, ut in quandam caenosam latrinam, *in eius* animum *flagitia confluxerant: saeua*, scaeua, uirosa, ebriosa, peruicax, pertinax, in rapinis turpibus auara, in sumptibus foedis profusa, inimica fidei, *hostis pudicitiae*.

---

4 E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, II, Berlin 1909, p. 517, is fundamental on this; cf. Alan Cameron, «Palladas and Christian Polemic», *JRS* 55, 1965, p. 17, for further discussion and bibliography.

5 Pliny, *Ep.* X 96, 7-8; Fronto, Frag. 10 (Van Den Hout = Haines 2, p. 282).

6 «L'Ane d'or et le christianisme», *Latomus* 12, 1953, pp. 188-191.

7 Had he been in more typical and adventurous mood, Herrmann might have pointed to the words *tacitus ingemescerem*, with which Lucius prefaces his description of the baker's wife, as a deliberate clue to his source planted by Apuleius.

Linguistic parallels are sempiternally hazardous as a way of proving dependence or imitation [8]. Had it been merely of two historians describing the same thing, their shared language might well be dismissed as the inevitable process of a common theme producing a common vocabulary. Yet in the present case, the accumulation of parallels between an historian and a novelist writing in and for different generations is, to say the least, suggestive.

Thanks to its growing strength in Africa, Apuleius was bound to become aware of Christianity [9]. In seeking both to learn more about it and to attack it, he might very well have had recourse to Tacitus. It is well known that Tertullian exploited the pagan historian, something that may help the notion that Apuleius did likewise [10]. Furthermore, it is to be remembered that the novelist's catholic tastes [11] ran to historiography; Priscian [12] mentions his *Epitome Historiarum*, preserving a few words from it.

On all counts, then, there is a case for seeing a deliberate Tacitean echo [13]. And even if this be denied, the present investigation has produced stronger grounds than hitherto for believing that the baker's wife is meant to be understood as a Christian, thus perhaps doing something towards ending this particular dispute amongs Apuleian scholars.

---

8 Albeit, there might be parody of content as well. For easy instance, Tacitus says that the Christians were treated with mocking cruelty like animals, thanks to Nero's *quaesitissimis pœnis*. Lucius complains that *illa mulier miro me persequebatur odio* (the Tacitean *odio humani generis*, in the context of the sect's punishment, will be recalled), exposing him to condign unpleasantness. He is a victim of her *saeuitia*, just as the Christians were finally pitied as victims who were being sacrificed *in saeuitiam unius*.

9 See P. G. Walsh, «Lucius Madaurensis», *Phoenix* 22, 1968, pp. 151-157, restated in his *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge 1970, pp. 186-187; cf. the reservations of Griffiths, *Commentary*, pp. 5-6.

10 Cf. F. Haverfield, «Tacitus During the Late Roman Period and the Middle Ages», *JRS*, 1916, p. 198. I am writing elsewhere on a possible allusion to Tacitus by Aulus Gellius.

11 For which, cf. Apuleius' own testimony in *Apol.* 36-38; *Florida* 20.

12 Keil, *GL* II, p. 250; III, p. 482. In his Budé edition of the *Apology* and *Florida* (p. xvii), Vallette takes *Historiarum* as alluding to the *Erotikos* mentioned by John Lydus (*De Mag.* III 64). However, the words and phrases preserved by Priscian —*gens Aeneanica, cuspis, semissis*— suggest some sort of history proper. And in *Florida* 20, Xenophon's works are called *historias*.

13 Without implying that it proves anything, one might note that *Laurentianus* 68, 2, the authority for Apuleius' text, also contains Tacitus, *Ann.* XI-XVI; cf. Vallette, p. xxxiii.

XLVII

NERO AND HIS MOTHER'S CORPSE

According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 14, 9), *aspexeritne matrem exanimem Nero et formam corporis eius laudaverit, sunt qui tradiderint, sunt qui abnuant.* Dio Cassius (61, 14, 2) has a similar tale: the emperor gazed at Agrippina's body and commented that he had not realised how beautiful his mother had been. The version of Suetonius (*Nero* 34, 4) is more confident than the Tacitean one, and more graphic than that of both historians: *adduntur his atrociora nec incertis auctoribus: ad visendum interfectae cadaver accurrisse, contrectasse membra, alia vituperasse, alia laudasse, sitique interim oborta bibisse.*

The truth of these stories was denied by Furneaux, in his commentary on the *Annals*. Although not explicit, E. Koestermann (in his note on the Tacitus passage) seems inclined to agree, since he commends the scepticism of Tacitus as opposed to the blithe acceptance by Dio and Suetonius. The purpose of this present note is to suggest that Nero was in fact going through one of his typically theatrical performances.

Handling the individual limbs of a royal corpse imports recollection of Agave and Pentheus in the *Bacchae* of Euripides. Although there is a lacuna at the critical stage in our texts [1]), we know from the third-century rhetorician Apsines [2]) that Agave embraced each of Pentheus' limbs in turn, lamenting over it. The presence of this description in a late rhetorician suggests that the scene had become a *topos* for the school rooms. Such a notion gains support from the fact that it turns up again in that excruciating Euripidean cento of the Eleventh Century, the *Christus Patiens* [3]).

Our Roman situation exactly reverses the original. Agave had unwittingly killed her royal son Pentheus; Nero has knowingly had his own mother slaughtered. The moment was tailor-made for his characteristic histrionic tastes. It is hard to decide whether he went through a comedy, as the sources suggest, or synthetic grief. Both moods are typical of the emperor. On the one hand, he greeted the severed head of Rubellius Plautus with a crude joke (*Ann.* 14, 59). By contrast, on the occasion of the demise of his infant daughter, he was *ut laetitiae, ita maeroris immodicus* (*Ann.* 15, 23). Either way, his calling for a drink during the performance would be appropriate to the scene.

The proposed connection with the *Bacchae* is enhanced by a detail elsewhere in Dio Cassius. After his mother's death, Nero soon makes his stage début. Dio (61, 20, 2) states that the emperor's inaugural piece was the *Atthis* or the *Bacchae*. Such a choice may well imply that the theatrical possibilities adumbrated in this note were visibly present in Nero's mind.

Furthermore, neither of the titles given by Dio are listed in the Suetonian account of Nero's repertoire (*Nero* 21, 3). Dio must have got them from a lost source, no doubt one of those adduced by Tacitus. It is not impossible that the propinquity of a Bacchic performance to the extravagant behaviour over Agrippina's body was there noted and connected.

1) For details, cf. the edition of E. R. Dodds (Oxford 1960).
2) Walz, *Rhet. Graec.* 9, 587.
3) See especially 11, 1257, 1311 ff., 1466 ff. The *Christus Patiens* became attached to the poems of Gregory Nazianzus (text in Migne, *PG* 38, 131-338).

XLVIII

THE HAPLESS HELMSMAN

Occiso centurione ac militibus, qui ad tradendam disciplinam inmixti manipulis exemplum et rectores habebantur, tris liburnicas adactis per vim gubernatoribus ascendere; et uno *remigante*, suspectis duobus eoque interfectis, nondum vulgato rumore ut miraculum praevehebantur.[1]

Remigante has been described as the most emended word in the *Agricola*. This manuscript reading is obelised by Furneaux, rejected by Furneaux-Anderson,[2] and retained, "with misgiving," by Ogilvie-Richmond in their recent edition.[3] A large number of unconvincing emendations adorn the *apparatus criticus*.

It is hard to understand this fuss. *Remigante* is quite defensible. The verb itself occasions no particular comment,[4] though it is perhaps notable that Tacitus seems to use it only once elsewhere, and in the *Agricola* at that.[5] In our present passage, there is dispute over the translation. Ogilvie-Richmond insist that *remigare* can mean only "to row," against those who would translate "steer." This is a minor point, though I would say that Ogilvie-Richmond are absurdly dogmatic. Since, as they admit, the rudder was actually a large oar, the distinction is very fine.[6] Nor can we safely tie Tacitus down to such rigidity. Was there ever a prose author more free in his extension of word meanings?

Whether our *gubernator* was steering or rowing is immaterial to the textual point. He falls foul of the editors on another count, however. The piratical Usipi eventually lose their stolen ships *per inscitiam regendi*. For

1. Tacitus, *Agricola* 28: I print the *OCT* text of H. Furneaux.

2. *Cornelii Tacitus de vita Agricolae*, edited by H. Furneaux and revised by J.G.C. Anderson (2nd edition, Oxford 1922), p. 117.

3. *Cornelii Taciti de vita Agricolae*, edited by R.M. Ogilvie and the late Sir Ian Richmond (Oxford 1967), p. 246.

4. It is used by such diverse authors as Cicero, Caesar, Seneca The Younger, and Claudian.

5. *Agricola* 10: *mare pigrum et grave remigantibus.*

6. For steering in general, and the Liburnian in particular, see L. Casson, *The Ancient Mariners* (Minerva Press 1959), especially pp. 213-4.

Ogilvie-Richmond, this "shows that there was no professional at the helm." Furneaux-Anderson maintain that, had the helmsman disappeared during the voyage, Tacitus "could hardly have failed to mention such a fact." This is preposterous. Tacitus records that, before losing the ships, the raiders had been driven by hunger *ut infirmissimos suorum, mox sorte ductos vescerentur.* Need we look any further for the fate of the hapless helmsman? We admit that it was folly to include this professional on the menu, since his expertise might have saved his captors. But *Sors* takes no account of such practicalities, and a prisoner would be naturally high on the list of expendables.

The reading *remigante* makes perfect sense and the present tense, contrasting with *suspectis duobus eoque interfectis*, is grimly comic. The prudent helmsman rows (or steers) literally for his life, inspired by the fate of his comrades. Perhaps he later escaped; if not, it seems very likely that he was one of those eaten by the hungry adventurers.

I hope that this note will act as *gubernator* for our editors and steer (or row) them back to what Tacitus actually wrote.

AULUS GELLIUS

XLIX

AULUS GELLIUS AND HIS CIRCLE

Though lacking the Scotsman's self-absorption, Gellius is to some degree recognisable as a Roman Boswell, serving a considerable number of cut-price, and sometimes cut-throat, Johnsons. A student and hierophant, he was acquainted with the luminous, as well as the voluminous, intellectuals of the first half of the second century. Gellius was himself born to play second fiddle. He never penetrated the corridors of power. No emperor is mentioned by name save Hadrian; always *divus* and respectfully regarded.[1] Two attendances at imperial *salutationes* are registered.[2] Both seem to belong to the reign of Pius; one of them indeed, with the help of a plausible textual emendation by Gronovius, is datable to *c.* 150. However, Gellius is concerned only to record the donnish chat that went on before the levées, and he is explicit in stating that *omnium fere ordinum multitudo* waited in the outward rooms. No mark of honour here. Unlike so many of the Eastern, and the occasional Western, sophists, Gellius' career did not advance beyond one or two legal appointments and a good deal of bathing in reflected glory.

The most frequent exhibit in the *Noctes Atticae* is Favorinus of Arelate. This exotic creature makes twenty-seven appearances, and is cited or alluded to on six other occasions.[3] Gellius' delineation is plausible as far as it goes. Favorinus is constantly introduced as *philosophus*; he descants at the drop of a reference on the minutiae of Greek and Latin vocabulary; he has a fund of recondite knowledge which he is only too willing to share with all comers. Gellius, of course, provided the sort of audience professors dream of. The picture is consistent with that given by Philostratus and the Suda.[4]

As far as it goes: that is the operative phrase. The other sources accord a sensational career to Favorinus. He was notorious for being sexually over or under endowed. Hermaphrodite or eunuch? The sources cannot decide, but

---

*An earlier version of this paper was read to the Classical Association of Canada at the meeting of the Learned Societies at the Memorial University of Newfoundland in May, 1971.

1. *NA* 3. 16. 12; 11. 15. 3; 13. 22. 1; 16. 14. 4.

2. *NA* 4. 1. 1; 20. 1. 2.

3. *NA* 1. 10. 1; 1. 15. 17; 1. 21. 4; 2.5; 2.12. 15; 2. 22. 1; 2. 26. 1; 3. 1. 1; 3.3. 6; 3. 16. 17; 3. 19. 1; 4. 1. 1; 5. 11. 8; 8. 2; 8. 14; 9, 8. 3; 9. 13. 5; 10. 12. 9; 11. 5. 5; 12. 1. 1; 13. 25.2; 14. 1. 1; 14. 2. 11; 16. 3. 1; 17. 10. 1; 17. 12. 1; 17. 19. 1; 18. 1. 1; 18. 7. 2; 19. 3. 1; 20. 1. 2. See also the quotations at 1. 3. 27; 2. 1. 3.

4. Philostratus, *VS* 489f; see E. Mensching, *Favorin von Arelate* (1963), 3f for the *testimonia*, and also A. Barigazzi, *Opere: Favorino di Arelate* (1966).

the anatomical jesting extends through Lucian and Philostratus to the Suda.[5] Gellius is predictably silent on the matter. However, in one item in the *Noctes Atticae* (9. 4. 16), the elder Pliny is thus quoted: *gignuntur homines utriusque sexus, quos hermaphroditos vocamus, olim androgynos vocatos et in prodigiis habitos, nunc vero in deliciis*. Favorinus would not have liked this classification; one speculates, and hopes, that there is a touch of sly humour in Gellius' quotation.

Identical silence is displayed on Favorinus' quarrels with the emperor Hadrian[6] and the sophist Polemo,[7] his possible exile to Chios,[8] and his friendship with Herodes Atticus. Nor, apart from a conventional plaudit for his *Graeca facundia*, is any great stress laid on his sophistic abilities. Why this unremitting silence? The same circumscribed pictures are presented in other cases; notably those of Herodes and (perhaps) Peregrinus Proteus. The suppresions might be deemed logical. Gellius set himself up as scholar, not Roman precursor of Philostratus. Yet he was by no means a master of relevancy; surprise that more personalia do not intrude into his discursive pages is valid. Perhaps tact is the operative word. Most of Favorinus' memories were unhappy ones, best relegated to oblivion. Even so, it is signal that Gellius permits himself no unkind word about Hadrian, the instrument of Favorinus' severest misfortunes. It was not mandatory to be indulgent to the memory of the late emperor in the Antonine period. *Divus* he might be, but Fronto can cast a stone at his spurious archaism.[9] And on the *divus*, Gellius may have been devious. Conspicuously absent or played down in the *Noctes Atticae* are the scholars Terentius Scaurus and Velius Celer. Both were on terms with Hadrian; Charisius and Priscian attest learned correspondence between them and the fractious scholar-emperor.[10] Perhaps Gellius sought to take oblique revenge for Favorinus by denying due credit to Hadrian's perhaps more favoured littérateurs.

The relative neglect of Favorinus' sophistic career is paralleled by similar playing down in the case of Herodes. The latter also has *facundia*, but appears as *consularis* and mocker of fake philosophers. The latter role is piquant, when we remember Peregrinus. Gellius' attitude may be a compound of ideology and personal frustration. He uses the term *sophista*[11] as one of rebuke, and is fond

5. Favorinus is both eunuch and hermaphrodite in Philostratus, hermaphrodite only in the Suda, and a eunuch by his own reckoning and by that of Lucian (*Demonax* 12 and perhaps *Eunuchus* 7).

6. Dio, 69. 3. 4; *HA*, *Hadrian* 15. 12; 16. 11; Philostratus, *VS* 489.

7. See G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (1969), 90f, for a dissection of Philostratus' account.

8. See Bowerstock, 35f; for Favorinus' treatise on Exile, see Norsa-Vitelli, *Studi e Testi 3* (1931), and Barigazzi, 375f.

9. *Veteris eloquentiae colorem adumbratum ostendit Hadriana oratio* (Haines, 2.138).

10. Keil, *GL* 1. 209 (Charisius on Scaurus); 2. 547 (Priscian on Celer).

11. *NA* 17. 5. 3.

of comparing sophists with philosophers to the disadvantage of the former.[12] In the case of Polemo, there were special reasons for neglect. This sophist did not overly impress the young Marcus Aurelius in performance,[13] though Philostratus claims a greater respect at a later date.[14] Worse, Polemo penned a very nasty description of Favorinus' physique.[15] Gellius' distaste for sophists is relatively anachronistic for the second century. He may well have been more sincere than Lucian, the obvious point of comparison. But Gellius was human, in spite of Nettleship,[16] and may have resented the success which sophistic talents gained so often in this age.

Another notable feature of Gellius' descriptive technique is his general refusal to bring his great men together in debate. One exception stands out. *NA* 2. 26. 1 narrates how Favorinus took Gellius with him to visit the gouty Fronto. Sickbed settings are quite routine in the *Noctes Atticae*; Gellius himself was visited in Herodes' Cephisia retreat by his other philosophic mentor, Calvisius Taurus, when he was suffering from a bout of 'Greek tummy'.[17] Herodes is not there at the time. These morbid settings fit an age of hypochondria. Gout never interfered with Fronto's eloquence, and he has a lively discussion with Favorinus on colour words in Greek and Latin. Was it this seance which provoked Fronto's one unequivocal reference to Favorinus? *multa de Favorini nostri pigmentis fuci quisnam appingere prohibet*?[18]

Favorinus is never copulated with Herodes in the *Noctes Atticae*, though Philostratus claims they were intimate friends. Less surprisingly, in view of their frictions and litigations, Herodes and Fronto are kept apart. There are indeed minor and perhaps significant geographical patterns. Favorinus is almost always encountered in Rome, and is never outside Italy. Herodes is always in Greece, as is Calvisius Taurus. Least surprising is the separation of Herodes and Peregrinus.

Gellius really does not have much to say about Herodes or Fronto. The former gains four mentions,[19] Fronto five.[20] Both are dubbed consulars, thus setting up the year 143 as a rare chronological pointer for Gellius' own dates. In spite of the confidence of Van den Hout, there is no certain reference to Gellius in Fronto. The Gellius alluded to in a cryptic letter to Claudius Julianus (not registered in the Loeb of C. R. Haines) need not be Aulus.[21] There was no

12. *NA* 5. 3. 7; 17. 12. 1.
13. See the letter of 143 from Aurelius to Fronto (Haines, 1. 116); in general, see H. Jüttner, *De Polemonis rhetoris vita operibus arte* (1898).
14. Philostratus, *VS* 540.
15. *Physiog.* 1 (Foerster), 161f.
16. H. Nettleship, 'The *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius', *AJP* 4 (1883), 391f.
17. *NA* 18. 10. 2; see 12. 5. 2 for another example of the motif.
18. Haines, 1. 48.
19. *NA* 1. 2. 1; 9. 2. 1; 18. 10. 1; 19. 12. 1.
20. *NA* 2. 26. 1; 13. 29. 2; 19. 8. 1; 19. 10. 1; 19. 13. 1.
21. See P. K. Marshall, 'The Date of Birth of Aulus Gellius', *CP* 58 (1963), 143f.

shortage of Gellii in this period, though Aulus mentions no contemporary of the name. P. K. Marshall might well be right in equating Fronto's Gellius with the addressee of Arrian (identified by G. W. Bowersock[22] with L. Gellius Menander of Corinth).

We must say something about Peregrinus Proteus. Even more remarkable than the man himself is the respect accorded him by Gellius. *NA* 12. 11. 1 bills him as *virum gravem atque constantem*. Gellius often went to catch his philosphical pearls outside Athens, where Peregrinus (not yet called Proteus) lived à la Diogenes *in quodam tugurio*. Now there is no reason to doubt that Gellius' view of him was honest. One automatically judges Peregrinus by the malevolent pamphlet of Lucian: no criterion could be less safe. More pertinent is Philostratus' confirmation of Lucian's claim that Peregrinus was wont to clash in public with Herodes. In the *Noctes Atticae*, Herodes is represented as an opponent of long-haired pretenders to philosophy.[23] Either Gellius dropped his respect for Peregrinus at a hint from Herodes, or he had a winning ability for respecting opposites in friends. Our initial comparison between Gellius and Boswell may again be invoked. The adaptable Scot could get along with John Wilkes as well as Samuel Johnson. Also, there may be an extra dimension to Lucian's spleen. It is true that there is no warrant for F. G. Allinson's notion that Lucian (and Apuleius) participated in the soirées at Cephisia.[24] A faint pattern may yet be traced. Lucian's *Convivium* could conceivably be a skit on the donnish talk and convivial settings of Gellius. There are as many banquets as sickbeds in the *Noctes Atticae*; some might see a connection. Lucian was not specially enamoured of Herodes;[25] he liked to repeat the jokes about Favorinus' anatomy; he sought to blast the fame of Peregrinus; there are possible references, not complimentary, to Fronto and Arrian in the *How to Write History*. An inconclusive collocation, but perhaps indicative of a desire to deflate the luminaries of Gellius' circles.

The chronology of Gellius is vexed. Radulphus de Diceto asseverated that *Agellius scribit CLXIX: quot homines tot sententiae*. If true, why no mention of Peregrinus' self-immolation in 165? We have seen that the omission of such a spectacular episode is not alien to Gellius' method. Conversely, he might have noted the event. Peregrinus featured in an item in the missing Book 8 of the *Noctes Atticae*. Other personalities provide pertinent chronological allusions and delusions. Through Sulpicius Apollinaris, Gellius had some knowledge of the prestigious Erucius Clarus, now known (from the *Fasti Ostienses*) to have died in March, 146.[26] Calvisius Taurus (who might or might not be the Taurus of Tyre claimed by Philostratus as one of Herodes' tutors) has been

22. *Op. cit.*, 113,
23. *NA* 9. 2. 1.
24. *Lucian: Satirist and Artist* (1927), 18–20.
25. *Demonax* 24, 33; the attitude of *Peregrinus* 19 is ambiguous.
26. On all this, see Marshall's article.

equated with the Calvenus Taurus to whom the Delphians set up an honorific inscription at the Pythian games of 163.[27] Favorinus once took Gellius to hear him dissuade a new mother from wet-nursing her son (*NA* 12. 1). Birley[28] conjectured that this may refer to Domitia Lucilla and the birth of Marcus Aurelius. Unlikely; but it shows the depth of our ignorance of Gellius' life.

Some writers, notably Nettleship, have expressed horror at the alleged intellectual futility manifest in the anecdotes of the *Noctes Atticae*. Nettleship did not perceive that his own scholarship might be vulnerable to the same charge. The circles of Gellius show devotion to minute studies of language, textual criticism, and style. What was wrong with that? Certainly, any contributor to this journal would not be out of place in a Gellius soirée. He was no Lexiphanes. Gellius and Favorinus alike ridicule excessive love of archaic style; the tone is that of Lucian. Nor is there need to see Gellius' interlocutors as men of straw, 'throwing pseudo-light onto non-problems' (as Amis' Lucky Jim puts it). The *Noctes Atticae* are in tune with the vignettes of Lucian, Philostratus, and (later) Athenaeus. If they are sterile, it was a mark of the age, not just of poor Gellius. An assemblage of cantankerous scholars engaged in Oneupmanship is all too plausible. Gellius' interests are diverse and reasonable.

27. Again, see Marshall.
28. A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (1966), 29–30.

L

AULUS GELLIUS ON VERGIL

Gellius was no great scholar on all matters Vergilian. This is inadvertently revealed by him in *NA* 19. 8. 18, where he says he was unable to find any example of the plural *harenae* (he had been set to hunt up this and other plural usages as a little research project by Fronto) in the works *doctorum hominum*, except for Julius Caesar, who had earlier been cited by Fronto as having stigmatised *harenae* in his *De Analogia* as *vitiose*. In fact, *harenae* occurs quite often in Vergil (e.g. *Georg.* 2. 106, 139, 232; *Aen.* 1. 107; 3. 557; 9. 714), as well as in other Augustan poets and post-Augustan literature.

However, it is salutary to find that Vergil was often discussed in Gellius' scholarly circles, and not just as a repository of rare words and arcane usages. A superficial glance at the *Noctes Atticae* (and some of this work is not worth more than that – *experto crede*!) tends, wrongly, to suggest that for Gellius and company Roman literature stopped in the late second century B.C. In fact, apart from Vergil, there is occasional mention of Horace (*NA* 2. 22. 25, perhaps also 2.22. 2) and Catullus (*NA* 6. 20. 6; 7.16. 2f.; 19.9.7). Nor were the Gellian circles obsessed by archaism to the exclusion of all else; both Gellius and his mentors Favorinus and Fronto condemned the extreme archaists of their time in tones as contemptuous as those of Lucian or Galen (see e.g., *NA* 1. 10; 11. 7. 1). Scholarly debate on the respective merits of early and later Roman literature was sharpened by such heterodox attitudes as those of the emperor Hadrian, who preferred Antimachus to Homer and Ennius to Vergil. It will be seen that Vergil is treated critically, praised for some aspects of his style and castigated for others. Which is as it should be. Gellius and company cultivated scholarly interests by no means stiflingly trivial as Nettleship would have one believe in his canonical article. ("*Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius", *AJP* 4 (1883), 391f.).

First, for information and possible significance, a few statistics may be registered. The *Bucolics* are cited only three times: one reference each to poems 3, 6, and 9. This mathematical sequence is meaningless, except perhaps to those who specialise in detecting mathematical patterns in ancient poets. Each *Georgic* is represented: seven references to the first one, five to the second, five again to the third, and three to the fourth. Each book of the *Aeneid* is cited: there are six allusions to the first one, six to the second, six to the third, four to the fourth, five to the fifth, eleven to the sixth, four to the seventh, three to the eighth, one to the ninth, three to the tenth, four to the eleventh, and one to the twelfth. The *Appendix Vergiliana* is excluded. It is possible that the above proportions represent some trends either in the Roman curriculum and/or in general taste. Certainly, the preponderance of references to *Aeneid* 6 would not surprise anyone. But all this must be qualified by commonsense caution. Most of the allusions are quotations to prove a point, and could have been selected at random, from anthologies or critical compendia, or from memory. The longest quotation does not exceed

eight lines (*Aen.* 3. 570-7: *NA* 17. 10. 10). One passage only is referred to more than once: *Aen.* 6. 365-6, which is discussed in separate contexts at *NA* 4.17.9 and 10. 16. 1.

Vergil receives casual compliments from time to time in the formulaic manner of the *Noctes Atticae*; for instance, Sextus Caecilius (*NA* 20.1.54) cites *Aen.* 8. 643 (*at tu dictis, Albane, maneres*) and dubs him *elegantissimus poeta.* But there is little in the way of a formal appreciation. The nearest approach is the lecturette delivered by Favorinus to Gellius at a friend's summer villa at Antium (another standard Gellian scene) on the respective merits of Vergil and Pindar. (*NA* 17. 10. 1 ff.). The Roman poet is praised for his painstaking craftsmanship, and the well-known simile of the mother bear licking her cubs into shape is employed. However, Favorinus went on to compare the two poets' descriptions of Mount Aetna (*Pyth.* 1. 21 ff.; *Aen.* 3. 570-7), to the complete discredit of Vergil. He is accused of scientific inaccuracy, laboured imagery, and mistranslation from the Greek. The lines:

> **interdum scopulos avulsaque viscera montis**
> **erigit eructans liquefactaque saxa sub auras**
> **cum gemitu glomerat fundoque exaestuat imo**

are written off as *omnium quae monstra dicuntur monstruosissimum*, and the entire passage dismissed as *versus, quos inchoasse eum verius dixerim, quam fecisse.*

Every man to his taste. One suspects that Favorinus would not always have got away with this critique in a seminar of Vergil scholars; Gellius was a tamer and safer audience. However, the theme of Vergil's use and abuse of Greek models is frequent in the *Noctes Atticae*. It appears that examination questions have not changed much over the ages. Two of the three references to the *Bucolics* bear on this matter. *NA* 9. 9 describes Gellius and a group of friends reading Vergil and Theocritus together at table. Vergil's *malo me Galatea petit, lasciva puella, / et fugit ad salices et se cupit ante videri* (3. 64-5) are *non abest quin iucundius lepidiusque* than the Theocritean original (*Idyl.* 5. 88f.). And Vergil's version (9. 23-5) of Theocritus' lines urging Tityrus to feed goats (*Idyl.* 3. 3ff.) is commended for its clever adaptation of a difficult original. By contrast, Valerius Probus (often cited by Gellius on Vergil) is invoked for the view that *Aen.* 1. 498 (on Diana leading her train) was Vergil's worst imitation of Homer (*Od.* 6. 102 ff.). Gellius himself ventures a condemnation of *Aen.* 3. 119 (*taurum Neptuno, taurum tibi, pulcher Apollo*) as being too newfangled and *quodam quasi ferumine inmisso fucatior*, when compared to Homer's original (*Il.* 11. 728). On the other hand, in the same article (*NA* 13. 27), Gellius thought *Georg.* 1. 437 (*Glauco et Panopeae et Inoo Melicertae*) quite as good as the original of Parthenius.

Particular details of Vergil's style are often discussed. A long debate between Favorinus and Fronto (*NA* 2.26) on various words for colours in Greek and Latin focuses attention on Vergil's use of *glaucus, flavus*, and *fulvus*. Two Vergilian uses of *inamabilis* (*Georg.* 4. 479; *Aen.* 6. 438) are commended (*NA*

2. 6. 13). So also is the poet's conceit of *squalentem auro* and cognate phrases (*NA* 2. 6. 3, 21). A frequent topic is Vergil's attention to euphony, a matter often invoked by Probus when discussing variant readings (e.g., *NA* 6. 20. 1; 13. 21. 4, 5, 6, 11, 12). Distinctive uses of common words are occasionally discussed, sometimes in a spirit of defence by Gellius, especially when it is a question of rebutting criticisms of Seneca or Annaeus Cornutus, for whose attitudes Gellius has little time (*NA* 2. 6. 1; 12. 2. 2). Such words include *vexasse* (*NA* 2. 6. 1); *superesse* (*NA* 1. 22. 12, 13); *ignarus* (*NA* 9. 12. 22); *vestibulum* (*NA* 16. 5. 11); and *iapyx* (*NA* 2. 22. 23). More technical matters included certain forms (eg., *NA* 4. 16. 7 – the datives *aspectu* and *concubitu*), metrical quantities (*NA* 4. 17. 5, 11), the poet's use of ellipsis (*NA* 5. 8. 5), and double meanings (*NA* 9. 12. 17).

Two themes of special interest, for Gellius and moderns alike, are textual criticism and antiquarian lore. Questions of text are usually cited from Probus (*NA* 13. 21. 4, 5, 6, 11, 12), but not invariably. The most fascinating discussion is at *NA* 2. 3. 5, where Gellius records that the distinguished grammarian (all Gellius' friends and mentors tend to be distinguished!) Fidus Optatus showed him a copy of *Aeneid* 2 which was *mirandae vetustatis*; it had cost twenty *aurei* in the Sigillaria. In this edition, the spelling *aena* in *Aen.* 2. 470 had been altered to *ahena* (the *h* being superscribed as a correction). Gellius claims a similar orthography for the word at *Georg.* 1. 296, *in optimis libris*. It is hard to know how much warrant all this should have. Gellius, like Probus, makes a point of the antiquity of his editions when defending or emending texts (one would like to see them debate the principle with Housman!), but where did authenticity end and one-upmanship begin?

In matters of antiquarian lore, it is notable that these generally occur in passages where Gellius is rebutting the criticisms of Julius Hyginus (though this scholar is also lavishly praised on occasion by Gellius): *NA* 10. 16 is the *locus classicus*. This was not the only type of criticism of Vergil which Gellius and company found it necessary to argue against. Sulpicius Apollinaris is represented as rejecting Caesellius Vindex' views on the inconsistencies of fact in *Aen.* 6. 760 f. (*NA* 2. 16. 1 ff.), whilst Annianus and other contemporary poets defended Vergil's prudish lines on the conjugal union of Venus and Vulcan (*Aen.*. 8. 404-6) against Annaeus Cornutus, who had amazingly found the inclusion of *membra* in the passage to be *paulo incautius* (*NA* 9. 10. 1-6 – Cornutus sounds like an old-time Alberta film censor!). All the above items afford a clue as to the contents of the various *Vergiliomastix* volumes which are known to have been circulating from the first century on.

The above survey demonstrates that there was a healthy clash of literary and scholarly opinions on Vergil from an early date. The poet had not fallen victim to any odour of sanctity. On matters of style, it is idle to dogmatise. Every reader will have to decide for himself where he thinks Gellius or Hyginus or Probus or Favorinus has a fair point. The early existence of textual uncertainties should provide both counsel and consolation to modern makes of texts. Above all, the survey helps to rescue Gellius and company from the

oft-repeated charge of insane pedantry and triviality; many of their discussions of our poet would not be unworthy of *Vergilius*.

Conspectus of References

Bucolics

3. 64-5: *NA* 9. 9. 6. Vergil's version of Theocritus (see above) is approved by Gellius.

9. 23-5: *NA* 9. 9. 11. As above.

6. 75-7: *NA* 2. 6. 1. Gellius defends Vergil's use of *vexasse* against Annaeus Cornutus' criticism of it as too weak in context.

Georgics

1. 25-6: *NA* 13. 21. 4. Probus defends the form *urbis* against *urbes* on the grounds of euphony, and claims he had seen a text in which this correction had been made by Vergil's own hand.

1. 199-203: *NA* 10. 29. 4. Gellius claims that *atque* is used in this passage as an equivalent for *statim*.

1. 208: *NA* 9. 14. 7. *Dies* is allegedly used for *diei*, and Gellius follows scholars who had seen a manuscript in Vergil's own hand with this reading.

1. 259-61: *NA* 10. 11. 6. Vergil's distinctive use of *maturare* and *properare* is praised as *elegantissime*.

1. 296: *NA* 2. 3. 6. On the spelling *aheni* (see above).

1. 395-6: *NA* 6. 17. 8. Gellius, in a typical scene, clashes with a foolish *grammaticus* over Vergil's particular use of *obnoxius*.

1. 437: *NA* 13. 27. 2. Vergil's emulation of a line of Parthenius (see above).

2. 18-19: *NA* 4. 17. 5. On the lengthened prefix in *subicit*.

2. 224-5: *NA* 6. 20. 1. Vergil allegedly changed *Nola* to *ora* out of pique at the inhabitants of Nola for refusing him water rights for his estate.

2. 246-7: *NA* 1. 21. 1. Hyginus and others read *amaror* for *amaro*, a reading allegedly confirmed by a manuscript from Vergil's own house and accepted by Favorinus (therefore, also by Gellius). The change of *sensu* to *sensus* is also discussed.

2. 438-9: *NA* 6. 17. 9. See above entry under 1. 395-6.

2. 479-80: *NA* 4. 17. 11. Sulpicius Apollinaris on the shortened *o* in *obicibus*, and also on the stressed pronunciation of the *i* in this word.

3. 4-5: *NA* 2. 6. 3. Gellius defends the force of *inlaudati* against the Annaeus Cornutus type of critic.

3. 10: *NA* 1. 22. 12. The learned Julius Paulus on the somewhat irregular use of *superesse*.

3. 82: *NA* 2. 26. 18. Fronto (in the long debate with Favorinus on colour words in Greek and Latin), on Vergil's use of *glaucus*.

3. 115-17: *NA* 18. 5. 7. Antonius Julianus on Vergil's use of *eques* for *equus*, in imitation of Ennius. The point arose out of a reading of Ennius (*Ann.* 7) in a Puteoli theatre by a celebrated *Ennianista*.

3. 126-7: *NA* 1. 22. 13. On *superesse* again.

4. 6-7: *NA* 5. 12. 13. Praise of Vergil's antiquarian expertise.

4. 198: *NA* 4. 16. 7. On the dative form *concubitu*.

4. 479: *NA* 2. 6. 13. Vergil is commended for applying *inamabilis* to the Stygian swamp.

Aeneid

1. 2-3: *NA* 10. 16. 6. Hyginus defends an allegedly anachronistic allusion to Lavinium.

1. 241: *NA* 13. 21. 12. On the euphony of *quem finem*.

1. 498-502: *NA* 9. 9. 13. Probus on Vergil's poorest imitation of Homer (see above).

1. 504: *NA* 9. 9. 14. Quoted to illustrate previous point.

1. 636: *NA* 9. 14. 8. The reading *dii* is defended against the *dei* of *inperitiores* critics.

1. 703-4: *NA* 4. 1. 15. Favorinus on whether Vergil wrote *longam* or *longo*; this is said to be a common crux, and both readings were current in the second century.

2. 224: *NA* 13. 21. 6. Probus defends the reading *securim* against *securem*.

2. 436: *NA* 9. 12. 17. On the use of *vulnus* to denote a wound inflicted, not a wound received.

2. 460: *NA* 13. 21. 6. Probus reads *turrim* for *turrem* for the sake of euphony (contrast with the discussion of *Georg.* 1. 25-6 above).

2. 469-70: *NA* 2. 3. 5. On the spelling of *abena* again; see above.

2. 554: *NA* 13. 21. 12. Probus defends the reading *haec finis* on the grounds of euphony.

2. 722: *NA* 2. 26. 11. Vergil's use of *fulvus* (from the above-mentioned debate on colour words).

3. 106: *NA* 13. 21. 5. Probus on variants *urbis-urbes* and euphony again.

3. 119: *NA* 13. 27. 3. Gellius criticises a borrowing from Homer (see above).

3. 460: *NA* 15. 13. 10. Vergil's use of such common verbs as *veneror* and *dignor*.

3. 475: *NA* 15. 13. 10. As above, on common verbs.

3. 570-7: *NA* 17. 10. 10. Favorinus' comparison of Pindar and Vergil on Aetna, to the latter's discredit (see discussion above).

3. 618-9: *NA* 5. 8. 5. Gellius defends a Vergilian ellipsis against the criticisms of Hyginus.

4. 261: *NA* 2. 26. 11. Vergil's use of *fulvus* again.

4.367: *NA* 12. 1. 20. Favorinus praises Vergil's imitation of Homer.

4. 590: *NA* 2. 26. 12. Vergil's use of *flavus* (from the debate on colour words).

4. 696: *NA* 13. 1. 5. A comment on Vergil's views on fate, as exemplified by his treatment of Dido's death.

5. 309: *NA* 2. 26. 13. Vergil's use of *flavus* again.

5. 372: *NA* 5. 8. 5. Another defence of ellipsis in Vergil.

5. 374: *NA* 2. 26. 11. Vergil's use of *fulvus* again.

5. 401-2: *NA* 5. 8. 5. Ellipsis again.

5. 738-9: *NA* 3. 2. 15. The passage is quoted to illustrate an abstruse bit of calendar reckoning.

6. 14-15: *NA* 7. 6. 1. Gellius defends the phrase *pennis praepetibus* against Hyginus' condemnation.

6. 17: *NA* 10. 16. 7. Hyginus on an alleged anachronism in Vergil's Roman history.

6. 122-3: *NA* 10. 16. 12. Hyginus on a confusion of religious lore.

6. 167: *NA* 5. 8. 11. Gellius on Vergil's use of *lituus* for *tuba*.

6. 273-4: *NA* 16. 5. 11. On Vergil's use of *vestibulum*.

6. 365-6: *NA* 4. 17. 9; 10. 16. 1. The first discussion is on the metrical quantity of *inice*, the second is inspired by yet another criticism of the poet's knowledge of Roman history by Hyginus.

6. 438: *NA* 2. 6. 13. A second praise of Vergil's use of *inamabilis*.

6. 465. *NA* 4. 16. 7. On the dative form *aspectu*.

6. 617-18: *NA* 10. 16. 12. Hyginus' criticisms of Vergil's religious lore.

6. 760-66: *NA* 2. 16. 1. Sulpicius Apollinaris rejects the criticisms of Caesellius Vindex of the alleged inconsistencies in this passage.

6. 838-40: *NA* 2. 16. 4. Hyginus on – yes, you will have guessed it! – errors in Vergil.

7. 93: *NA* 16. 6. 3. Gellius ridicules a vainglorious *litterator* for his ignorance of the usage *bidentes*.

7. 187-88: *NA* 5. 8. 1. Hyginus on Vergil's mistake re *lituus*, and an ellipsis.

7. 279: *NA* 2. 26. 11. Vergil's use of *fulvus* again.

7. 688: *NA* 2. 26. 11. The same again.

8. 404-6: *NA* 9. 10. 1. Vergil's prudish treatment of a sexual theme is praised (see earlier discussion).

8. 643: *NA* 20. 1. 54. Sextus Caecilius quotes this passage, calling the poet *elegantissimus* for it.

8. 710: *NA* 2. 22. 23. On Vergil's use of *iapyx*, in a lecture on winds by (suitably enough!) Favorinus.

9. 616: *NA* 6. 12. 6. This is quoted to prove that Vergil disapproved of effeminate dress; one of Gellius' silliest comments.

10. 314: *NA* 2. 6. 4. Gellius justifies the conceit *squalentem auro*.

10. 350-1: *NA* 13. 21. 11. Gellius, in emulation of Probus, discusses the variants *tres-tris* with regard to euphony.

10. 706: *NA* 9. 12. 22. On Vergil's particular use of *ignarus*.

11. 487-8: *NA* 2. 6. 22. A variant on the *squalentem auro* point.

11. 678: *NA* 2. 22. 23. On *iapyx* again.

11. 751-2: *NA* 2. 26. 11. Vergil's use of *fulvus* again.

11. 770-1: *NA* 2. 6. 21. The *squalentem auro* conceit again, with cognate examples.

12. 407-8: *NA* 8. 5. The article is lost; the lemma indicates a discussion of the meaning of *caelum stare pulvere*.

*I wish to thank the anonymous referee of *Vergilius* for his very thorough and helpful criticisms of the first draft of this paper. I have not accepted all of them, but that is not the point; would that all referees were so helpful!

LI
AN ANONYMOUS LATIN POEM IN GELLIUS

NA 19,11 is consecrated to a discussion of the allegedly Platonic couplet:

τὴν ψυχὴν Ἀγάθωνα φιλῶν ἐπὶ χείλεσιν ἔσχον
ἦλθε γὰρ ἡ τλήμων ὡς διαβησομένη (AP 5,78)

After commending these lines for being *lepidissimi et venustissimae brevitatis*, Gellius appends an extended (*in plures versiculos licentius liberiusque*) Latin version, thus:

Dum semihiulco savio
meum puellum savior
dulcemque florem spiritus
duco ex aperto tramite
†*anima aegra et saucia*
cucurrit ad labeas mihi
rictumque in oris pervium
et labra pueri mollia,
rimata itineri transitus,
ut transiliret nititur.
Tum si morae quid plusculae
fuisset in coetu osculi,
Amoris igni percita
transisset et me linqueret
et mira prorsum res foret,
ut fierem ad me mortuus,
ad puerum ⟨*ut*⟩ *intus viverem.* (Morel, FPL 139)

These iambic dimeters are attributed to a certain *amicus meus, οὐκ ἄμουσος adulescens.* They have never attracted much attention from modern scholars. There has, however, been some desultory discussion of their authorship, with two conflicting conclusions: either the verses are the work of Gellius' admired mentor, Favorinus of Arelate, or they are really from the pen of Gellius himself, thinly disguised. The present paper offers an analysis of the poem to show that it looks like a typical confection of the Antonine age, and gives reasons for rejecting both the foregoing hypotheses concerning authorship in favour of taking Gellius at face value.

The following linguistic points are instructive in determining the nature of the piece:

semihiulco. Apparently a *hapax legomenon.* At any rate, no other example is adduced by Stephanus, Forcellini, or Lewis & Short; it does not appear in Du Cange or the dictionaries of Mediaeval Latin; nor was it ever discussed in the various Latin Glossaries or by any of Keil's Grammatici Latini and the like. In the present poem, it may well be a conscious variant of Catullus' *semihiante labello* (61,220). Also noteworthy are two Apuleian expressions: *semihianti voce* (Met. 5,18) and *semihiantes labeas* (Met. 10,28).

savio/savior. The verb *savior* (or *suavior*) occurs elsewhere in Gellius (3,15,3) and in poets such as Catullus (9,9). The jingling effect here achieved is paralleled by Apuleius' *savia suavia* (Met. 6,8).

puellus. A noun employed by Ennius, Plautus, and Lucilius. In this last case, Nonius (158,14) found it necessary to explain it as equivalent to *puer.* The word is explicitly described as an archaism by Suetonius, Cal. 8,4: *antiqui etiam puellas sicut et pueros puellos dictitarent.*

dulcemque florem spiritus. One will easily think of such poetic commonplaces as *flos aetatis*[1] (e.g. Catullus 62,46); it is

1 Cf. the remarks of J.C. Bramble à propos of Propertius 1,20,40 in Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry, Cambridge 1974, 90-91.

worth observing that Apuleius employed the phrase in an elegy in his Liber Ludicrorum (Morel 141). It may or may not be suggestive that Gellius talks elsewhere (9,4,10) about *florum spiritus*.[2]

anima aegra et saucia. The obvious precedent is Ennius, Medea 254 (Vahlen 164; Jocelyn 216): *animo aegro amore saevio saucia.* Few poets might be deemed more likely a model for Gellius or any Latinist of the Antonine period. Apuleius indeed is surely indebted to the same line in his phrase *aegra corporis animi saucia* (Met. 4,32). *Anima* is the reading of the manuscripts of both Gellius and Macrobius, Sat. 2,2,17, where the present poem is reproduced. In his Teubner edition of the latter, J.A. Willis[3] printed the old and obvious conjecture, *animula*. This inevitably recalls the emperor Hadrian's[4] famous *animula vagula blandula*, albeit commentators rarely observe a very similar effort by Septimius Serenus: *animula miserula properiter obiit* (fr. 16, in Morel 146; cf. his fr. 17: *perit abit avipedis animula leporis*).

labeas/rictum. Two striking parallels confirm the reading *rictum* here against the variants *rectum* and *luctum*. A fragment (156) of the comedian Pomponius offers *rictum et labeas cum considero*. Gellius himself (18,4,6) exhibits *rictu oris labearumque* (of a boastful *ignotus*).

pervium. The model is probably Plautine: *cor meum mihi nunc pervium est* (Pseud. 2,4,70).

rimata. The author may have had in mind Virgil's *partes rimatur apertas / qua vulnus letale ferat* (Aen. 11,748-9).

itineri. Compare, in context, the *iter amoris* of Cicero, ad Att. 4,2,1.

transiliret. The manuscripts of Macrobius have *transire*. Willis printed *transilire*, inspired in part by Havet's *vi transilire*. Could

2 Notice also *dulcius spirare* of euphonious vowel/consonant combinations in Quintilian 12,10,27.

3 Though it is printed neither by Morel nor any of Gellius' modern editors (the Teubner of Hosius, the OCT of Marshall, and the Loeb of Rolfe)

4 That is, accepting the authenticity of these verses; cf. the respective arguments of T.D. Barnes, CQ N.S. 18 (1968) 384, and B. Baldwin, CQ N.S. 20 (1970) 372.

our poet have had Horace's *ne quis modici transiliat munera Liberi* (Odes 1,18,7) in mind?

more plusculae. Cf. Cicero, ad fam. 12,12,2: *habeo paululum morae.* It is just worth remarking that Apuleius, who frequently uses *plusculus*, employs it of amorous nights (Met. 2,17).

coetu osculi. Gellius (1,25,16) has *quasi per quendam coetum* (sc. *vocum*).

amoris igni percita. One patent source for this conceit is the Plautine *amoris causa percitus* (Asin. 4,2,13); cf. Apuleius, Met. 1,7: *virgine percita.*

ad me. For this use of *ad* in the sense of *apud* or *in* with the ablative, see Lindsay, Syntax of Plautus 84.

puerum ut. The *ut* is Scaliger's. Bücheler suggested *puerulum* (Hosius and Willis both offered *puerulo*), which is printed in Marshall's OCT of Gellius. Although Lewis & Short refer it only to Cicero, this is an attractive suggestion in that it is a form often used by Apuleius.

The poem is exactly what we would have expected of an indifferent piece from the Antonine age, a medley of borrowed effects. That it should be so redolent of the early Roman writers is particularly unsurprising. And many of the other passages and parallels adduced are consonant with what we see elsewhere in Gellius. Virgil's presence requires no comment.[5] Horace, though not obviously popular in the second century, is nevertheless alluded to in NA 2,22,25 (cf. 2,22,1). Gellius dubs Catullus *elegantissimus poetarum* (6,26,6), deems some of his verses *omnium iudicio venustissimos* (7,16,2), and has him imported into a seminar by some captious Greek critics as one of the only two Roman poets (Calvus being the other) comparable with Hellenic ones (19,9,7).

Of particular moment are the various effects shared with Apuleius. They help to stamp the poem as typical of its time. So does the form of the piece. Morel calls it an *odarium*, which may or may

5 For a complete conspectus of these, see B. Baldwin, Aulus Gellius on Vergil, Vergilius 19 (1973) 22.

not be the right word - it occurs only in Petronius (Sat. 53,2), in the phrase *odaria saltare*. For all that, the type of metre is more prevalent in the fragments of Latin Poetry of the period than hexameters or elegiacs. Alphius Avitus and Marianus, for instance, use iambic dimeters (Morel 143-144); also comparable are the efforts of Hadrian, Florus, and Annianus (Morel 136-138).

In 1880, E. Maass equated Gellius' poetic friend with Favorinus. It is notable that one of his few followers was Hosius, editor of the Teubner text of Gellius.[6] There appear to be only two grounds for this identification: 1) Favorinus had an erotic bent; 2) the Platonic epigram is quoted by Diogenes Laertius (3,24) in a passage formally acknowledged to be from the Universal History of Favorinus (3,32).

Neither point is very compelling. The erotic side of Favorinus is (for us) represented chiefly by the familiar anecdotes concerning his eunuch or hermaphroditic condition. He nowhere appears in any erotic context in the Noctes Atticae. It is quite likely that he did quote Plato's epigram in his own writings; after all, he was a Platonist. But this hardly commits us to a belief that he must therefore have translated it into Latin. Nor is the erotic the point of the Greek original.[7] The item is reproduced by Macrobius as a c o m i c one: it is the sole contribution of the boxer-philosopher[8] Horus to an assemblage of jokes in the Saturnalia.

There are weighty arguments against the identification. For one thing, chronology hardly permits a situation whereby Gellius is older than Favorinus.[9] And it is barely conceivable, given the

---

6 E. Maass, De biographis Graecis (=Kiessling-Wilamowitz, Philologische Untersuchungen 3 [Berlin 1880]); Hosius, p. lxvi; cf. L. Ruske, De A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum fontibus quaestiones selectae (Breslau 1883).

7 Beware, incidentally, of the very late and somewhat misleading lemma to the Gellius passage: *ponit versus Platonis amatorios quos admodum iuvenis lusit dum tragoediis contendit.*

8 As is fitting in the context of the wrestler-philosopher!

9 A point developed by L. Gamberale, La traduzione in Gellio, Roma 1969, 162.

respectful tone adopted by Gellius on the thirty-three occasions in which he introduces or alludes to Favorinus, that he would ever have referred to the sage as *adulescens*. Indeed, NA 14,2, in which Gellius describes himself as a young man applying for legal guidance to the celebrated expert Favorinus, surely rules the possibility out altogether.

The accounts of Favorinus' literary activity in Philostratus and the Suda[10] do not suggest that he was a poet. True, he might be presumed able and willing to hit off the occasional epigram. But not in Latin, if we take at face value his untypically modest comment at NA 13,25,4: *etiamsi opera mihi princeps et prope omnis in litteris disciplinisque Graecis sumpta est, non usque eo tamen infrequens sum vocum Latinarum, quas subsicivio aut tumultuario studio colo ...* And, even if this evidence be played down, the employment of the unique, or at least very rare, epithet *semihiulco* runs quite counter to his diatribe against those who indulge in words *nimis priscas et ignotas in cotidianis communibusque sermonibus* (1,10,1).

This last factor also tells against the identification of the poet with Gellius himself.[11] For the latter does not merely quote the above sermon of Favorinus; he approves it, and stridently echoes it elsewhere (11,7,1). For both men, the whole issue is summed up by a prescription from the De Analogia of Julius Caesar: *ut tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum.*

It is most unlikely that Gellius has been coy in concealing his own authorship of the present poem. The procedure would be most untypical of him in such a matter. The business of translation or paraphrase from Greek into Latin frequently crops up in the Noctes

---

10 Philostratus, VS 489; Suda φ 4 (Adler); cf. the *testimonia* assembled by E. Mensching, Favorin von Arelate, Berlin 1963, 3-7.

11 Made by I. Fischer in his note on the present passage in the Rumanian translation of Gellius by D. Popescu, Bucarest 1965, and developed by G. Perini, L'Autore dell'incerti odarium e l'amicus di Gellio, Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Patavina di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti 82 (1969-70) 15-34.

Atticae.[12] On two occasions, Gellius tries his hand at rendering Plato. The first effort is lost, but the lemma (8,8) indicates that he did not hide his light under another's bushel: *quid mihi usu venerit interpretari et quasi effingere locos quosdam Platonicos Latina oratione.* The other opportunity (17,20,7) was provided by a seminar on the Symposium conducted by his other Platonist mentor, Calvisius Taurus. This mise en scène would have been ideal for subterfuge, had Gellius wished to hide his blushes. Instead, he portrays himself as responding to a direct challenge from Taurus, and insists on his own authorship (*nos...nos...ausi sumus...ex isdem illis verbis eius effinximus*).

The equation is not helped by the fact that whenever an *adulescens* is introduced into a dramatic vignette in the Noctes Atticae, his depiction is invariably hostile (1,2,3; 1,10,1; 9,15,2; 13,20,3). In the last of these cases, the victim is *adulescens non abhorrens a litteris* - exactly equivalent, in other words, to οὐκ ἄμουσος (cf. 14,6,1: *homo nobis familiaris in litterarum cultu non ignobilis*).

It might be held that Gellius' description of the author of our poem as *amicus meus* is suggestive. And indeed, an unnamed *amicus meus* wins the day at 5,22, as does another in 7,15. But the defeated opponent in this latter logomachy is *alter amicus*, which shows that the status of friend in these exchanges does not guarantee Gellian approval.

Finally, although *visi sunt non esse memoratu indigni*, it is plain that the verses in question are presented by Gellius as inferior to the original. After all, it takes seventeen Latin lines to paraphrase a Greek couplet singled out for *venustissimae brevitatis*. Macrobius borrows and echoes the judgement, commending the original for its *venustatem* and *brevitatem*, and subjoining that the Latin version is *tanto latius quanto solet nostra quam Graecorum lingua brevior et angustior aestimari*. It is most unlikely that Gellius would have inserted inferior stuff of his own devising into

12 On this, see Gamberale, op.cit., also B. Baldwin, Studies in Aulus Gellius, Lawrence 1975, 59-60.

such a context, especially since it would be particularly obtrusive as the only real example of *versus incerti auctoris* to occur throughout the teeming pages of the Noctes Atticae.[13]

Better on all counts to take Gellius at face value and accept the lines as the product of a friend.[14] The phrase οὐκ ἄμουσος, unique here in the Noctes Atticae, might connote a bilingual Greek acquaintance (of the type encountered in NA 19,9,7) or some Roman with a reputation for Hellenic learning. To attempt to put a name on him is futile. The phrase could conceivably have been enough for contemporaries to identify him. In any event, anonymous contributors are the commonest type of participant in the discussions of the Noctes Atticae, the final argument (perhaps) against not taking one rather that another at face value.[15]

Addendum

After completing this paper, I came across S. Gaselee's article The Soul in the Kiss in Criterion 2 (1924) 349-359. Gaselee, who accepts without discussion the Gellian verses as those of a young friend, provides a useful survey of the theme in classical and post-classical literature. For the former, he instances: Bion, Epitaph. Adon. 45-46; Meleager, AP 6,171; Achilles Tatius 2,8,37; Petronius, Sat. 79,132; Anth. Lat. 3,219. The Petronian examples are of some particular interest, given Macrobius' location of the version in Gellius in a comic context. The claims of Favorinus to authorship of the piece under review might appear enhanced by a passage in Stobaeus (63,407) to the effect that he was on record with a discussion of the theme. However, it is an obvious enough topic for a

13 Cf. Perini, art.cit., 17 n. 5 (the index of Marshall's OCT is more accurate than that of Hosius' Teubner in this regard).

14 As does H. Bardon, La littérature latine inconnue 2, Paris 1956, 234.

15 For those who do not believe that the exchanges in Gellius are anything more than literary artifice, it might be attractive to maintain that the translator of Plato is *adulescens* only to make him consonant with the youthfulness of his Greek model. Cf. note 8 for the suspicious (?) suitability of Horus.

Platonist (cf. my earlier remarks) and does not, I think, outweigh the previous arguments against ascribing the poem to him.

LUCIAN

LII

THE AUTHORSHIP AND PURPOSE OF LUCIAN'S *DEMOSTHENIS ENCOMIUM*

Virtually all modern editors and commentators regard this dialogue as non-Lucianic, despite its presence in the best manuscripts. The three most distinguished Lucianic scholars of this century, Helm, Bompaire, and Macleod are all of this persuasion.[1] Their usual objections are based on the alleged inferiority of the Greek style and language employed in the piece, and on the grounds of its inferior satirical qualities and general lack of inspiration.[2] By contrast, I hope to show in this paper that these objections can be rebutted, and that there is no good reason to reject the work. I believe that the dialogue does contain some of Lucian's best characteristics, and that it fits into the general context of second-century discussions of Demosthenes very effectively.

Macleod formulates his objections as follows:[3] 'I follow most editors in rejecting *In Praise of Demosthenes* as non-Lucianic because of its lack of inspiration, its inferior Greek and its avoidance of hiatus.' His first point is subjective, of course, and can only be countered by equally subjective thinking. However, his other two points can be met on more solid grounds.

The marked avoidance of hiatus is perhaps explicable, if we bear in mind the practice of Attic oratory. Although Demosthenes did not go to the extremes of Isocrates, he did tend to avoid hiatus to a marked degree; this point is remarked by modern writers.[4] Furthermore, Demosthenes is singled out by Quintilian, in his discussion on hiatus, for his care in this respect.[5] Although Quintilian is mainly concerned with Latin prose style, and is not himself opposed to all forms of hiatus,[6] his comment on Demosthenes may serve as a relevant guide to our discussion. Lucian might consciously avoid

[1] R. Helm, *RE* XIII, 1735-6; J. Bompaire, *Lucien écrivain* (Paris, 1958), p. 190, n. 2; p. 314, n. 2; M. D. Macleod, *Lucian*, Vol. viii (Loeb Library), p. 237. The dialogue is implicitly rejected by J. Schwartz, *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate* (Brussels, 1965).

[2] The dialogue is rejected by: K. Fritzsche, *Prolegomena*, Vol. iii, 2, p. lxxii (Rostock, 1860); M. Rothstein, *Quaestiones Lucianeae* (1888), p. 45; P. Boldermann, *Studia Lucianea* (1893), p. 128; F. Albers, *Luciani quae fertur Demosthenis Laudatio* (Leipzig, 1910). Albers commented: 'Demosthenis laudationem sub nomine Luciani falso relatam esse nunc inter omnes constat.' This was not straining the truth. The only real defender of the dialogue, apart from myself, has been A. Bauer (Paderborn, 1914). I rely heavily upon his linguistic analysis, but, as will be seen, my reasons for defending the piece differ sharply from his.

[3] Op. cit., p. 237.

[4] See, e.g., F. Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit* (Leipzig, 1893), Vol. iii, pp. 100 ff.; J. F. Dobson, *The Greek Orators* (London, 1919), p. 241; R. C. Jebb, *Attic Orators* (London, 1875; reprinted New York, 1962), Vol. ii, p. 397; G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, 1963), p. 209, n. 109.

[5] Quint. *Inst.* ix 4.33 ff. He couples Demosthenes with Cicero: 'Demosthenes et Cicero modice respexerunt ad hanc partem.'

[6] He cites Cicero (*Orator*, 23.77) with approval on the pleasing effect of certain types of hiatus.

hiatus as a stylistic tribute to his subject. One might accuse him of going to extremes, but this is understandable in such a self-conscious Attic stylist, and would not affect our argument.

Criticisms of the Greek style of the dialogue can be countered.

Helm assembled the following list of words and usages which he stigmatized as 'Sprache ganz unmöglich von Lukian'.[7] The following analysis will indicate that these occasion little alarm:

1. *πότερον* with a participle as a simple interrogative (§ 1). This is a regular Platonic idiom (see Ast's *Lexicon Platonicum* for examples).

2. *διαβαδίζειν* (§ 1). The verb occurs in Thucydides, Appian, Galen, and Dio Cassius.

3. *ἐξαναστὰς ἔδοξέ μοι* (§ 1). Helm presumably is objecting to the anacoluthon. But *ἔδοξέ μοι* came to be regarded as equivalent to *ἐγὼ ἡγοῦμαι*, and parallels can be adduced from such writers as Plato. See the examples given by Kühner-Gerth, ii, pp. 105-7.

4. *ἐπίδοξον* with a future infinitive passive (§ 3). Parallels can be adduced from Herodotus, Isocrates, and Plato. See the discussion in Lobeck's *Phrynichus*, pp. 132-3.

5. *κατορρωδεῖν* (§ 3). This verb occurs in Polybius.

6. *ἐλάττονος λόγου καταφαίνεται* (§ 4). A natural enough expression.

7. *καταφρονεῖν* with the accusative (§ 5). This construction is found, with the same sense of the verb, in Eur. *Ba.* 503 (see Dodds ad loc.) and in Thucydides; it also occurs in Herodotus and Antiphon, although the verb has a different sense in these examples.

8. *οἱ καταλογάδην* (§ 5). A close parallel can be found in Athenaeus.

9. *φανεῖσθαι φαύλης φροντίδος* (§ 5). Helm is misleading. The full phrase is *εἰ μέλλουσιν μὴ ταπεινοὶ φανεῖσθαι καὶ φαύλης φροντίδος* and the genitive is a simple descriptive one.

10. *ἐπιδρομή* (§ 5). A common word in writers of all periods. Helm also objects to *ἐπίδρομος*, which is Homeric and also found in later prose writers such as Plutarch.

11. *περιφρονεῖν* with the accusative (§ 8). A Thucydidean usage.

12. *ἀφθονία ἣν ἄν μοι περιττὸν εἰπόντος* (§ 10). I might have conceded this one to Helm! However, the later manuscripts read *περιττὴ πάντως* for *περιττὸν εἰπόντος*, and this reading is adopted by Macleod.

13. *παρεμπόρευμα* (§ 10). The word is also used metaphorically by Marcus Aurelius, and the cognate verb is found in Lucian, *Hist. Conscr.* 9.

14. *πατρονομία* (§ 12). Apparently found only here in literary texts, but it occurs in inscriptions in the technical sense of the Spartan office of *πατρονόμος*.

15. *θρύψεις* (§ 12). A technical term in Aristotle, and employed metaphorically in Xenophon and Plutarch. Helm does not reveal that the reading is uncertain; *θρέψεις* was the older reading (see Macleod, ad loc.).

16. *αὐτόχρημα* (§ 15). This adverb goes back to Aristophanes, and is found in such later writers as Aelian, Aristides and Julian.

17. *καταπυκνοῦν* (§ 14). A common philosophical term which is used metaphorically by Aristotle and Marcus Aurelius.

[7] Op. cit.

18. δημοθοινία (§ 16). Lucian has this word elsewhere (*Phalaris* i, 3); see the discussion in Lobeck's *Phrynichus*, p. 499.

19. τὰς ὀφρῦς συνάγειν (§ 16). The phrase is used more than once by Aristophanes.

20. ἅττω (§ 18). A well-attested Atticism.

21. ἁρματηλασία (§ 23). Found in Xenophon.

22. ἁρματοτροχία (§ 23). Occurs in Homer, Aelian, and Quintus Smyrnaeus.

23. ἀλεείνειν (§ 23). The narrator is made to use this Homericism by way of taking off the epic enthusiasms of Thersagoras. Homeric pastiches are quite often used by Lucian when the context admits of a comic effect. See, e.g., the more elaborate attempts in *J. Trag.* 6 and *Charon* 14 (the technique is discussed by J. Bompaire, op. cit., p. 625).

24. ἀλινδεῖσθαι (§ 24). Found in Plutarch and Alciphron; it is used in a bawdy sense by Herodas.

25. κελεύειν with the dative (§ 24). This usage occurs elsewhere in Lucian (*Dial. Mort.* i 1).

26. οἴκαδε for οἴκοι (§ 26). So used by Xenophon.

27. ἀπ' ἐλπίδος ἔσφηλας (§ 29). This verb is regularly used in the passive in this sense with the genitive; Lucian has σφαλεὶς τῆς ἐλπίδος (*Necyomant.* 6). The prepositional phrase here is hard to parallel, but is not impossible Greek.

28. πρόσκαιρος (§ 31). Later prose writers such as Plutarch and Galen have the adjective.

29. προσπάσχειν with the dative (§ 40). So used by Cicero, Philodemus, Plutarch, and Arrian.

30. 'Αριστοτέλει μάρτυρι (§ 40). This apparent dative absolute is paralleled in Aristides and Philostratus, but it could also be taken as a locative.

31. μετὰ χεῖρα ἔχειν (§ 50). Perhaps the regular usage with the plural should be read, but the expression may be explained by analogy or extension.

32. ἱκανή γ' ἂν οὐδ' ἡ Περικλέους (§ 20). The text is corrupt here (see Macleod), hence we can hardly argue the point either way.

33. θάτερον (§ 22). There is no reason why this form should excite comment.

34. ἤδη γέ σοι τῶν εὐαγγελίων χάριν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν επῶν (§ 26). Macleod prints χάρις. Either way, the expression is tolerable.

The above analysis[8] cannot fairly be pressed to any confident conclusions. However, it is notable that two of the usages condemned by Helm are in fact Lucianic. The fact that a considerable number of the stigmatized usages are found in later Greek prose is also significant. I further contend that the term 'non-Lucianic' has no valid meaning. The fact that a particular word or expression is found only once in an individual writer's extant works (and we have no assurance that we have all of Lucian's work) does not prove that the passage in question is spurious. A writer's selection and rejection of words and mannerisms is dictated by many considerations. He may become gradually addicted to certain usages, or he may come to eschew others. The subject matter of a particular piece may demand a special

[8] For a fuller analysis of these usages, see Bauer, op. cit.

style or vocabulary. The individual style is a flexible thing, capable of infinite development. Helm's dogmatic approach would be open to question in any context. With a stylist such as Lucian, who carefully cultivated his brand of Atticism, whose best work is steeped in satire and parody, and who was a vigorous polemicist against the pedants and purists of his day,[9] any dogmatic approach is both invalid and helpless.

As to the complaints that the piece is lacking in inspiration: even Helm would not agree with this, since he frankly admits its literary qualities.[10] A typical comment is that of Sandys:[11] 'The encomium of Demosthenes, found amongst Lucian's writings, shows a just appreciation of the patriotism of Demosthenes, but is wanting in wit and is probably spurious.'

This is a gross oversimplification.[12] The dialogue divides naturally into an introduction and three parts, thus:

§§ 1-5: Introduction. The Homeric poet Thersagoras meets the narrator (i.e. Lucian), and announces his intention of reciting some of his own poetry as a genethliacon to Homer. The narrator[13] retorts that he would like to pay a similar tribute to Demosthenes.

§§ 6-21: Thersagoras delivers a long encomium on the oratory and patriotism of Demosthenes, alleging that this is much easier than composing a panegyric on Homer, since all details of the Homeric question are so disputed.

§§ 22-28: The narrator remarks that Thersagoras is mistaken. He himself wants to create something new and avoid 'old tracks' which he long since tried and abandoned. Thersagoras then reads some poetry and gives the narrator a book from the 'Macedonian royal archives'; this volume contains a dialogue between Archias and Antipater on the virtues of Demosthenes. It includes the praises of the orator by Philip and Alexander, and closes with an account of the last words and death of Demosthenes.

§§ 29-50: The aforesaid dialogue is read out verbatim.

The whole piece has many flashes of typical Lucianic wit and style. Thersagoras is a subtle characterization; he is amusing and sometimes rather ridiculous. He is notorious in the city (probably Rhodes is the dramatic setting[14]); his physical features are clearly described (he is short, with a hooked nose, and going a little grey). His poetic zeal has got him out of bed early, for he has the idea that he is divinely inspired, though he is not quite sure of this! Nevertheless, he has felt it necessary to pray to the statue of Homer for a good flow of verse. He chatters with naïve pride about his laughable habit of comparing the style of Demosthenes and other prose writers with that of Homer. Indulging in a little literary criticism, he comments on the *Helen* of Isocrates and hails such minor figures as Alcidamas and Eubulides. His remarks are well seasoned with Pindaric and Homeric

[9] Outstanding examples are his *Lexiphanes* and his *Pseudologistes*. See my article 'The *Pseudologistes* of Lucian', *CR* xii (1962), 2-5.

[10] Helm, op. cit., finds its model in Peripatetic literature.

[11] J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1908), Vol. i, p. 316.

[12] The view derives from the scholiast, never a reliable witness to Lucian's merits!

[13] We have no formal *dramatis personae*, but the narrator discharges the usual role of Lycinus-Lucian.

[14] See Macleod, op. cit., p. 240, n. 1.

tags. His desire to prove the great amount of pabulum for an encomiographer of Demosthenes leads him to fantastic claims (e.g., it was a blessing to Demosthenes to have been orphaned, since this gave rise to the speech against Aphobus and so brought his genius into play and the public eye). One could multiply examples, but I have offered enough, I hope, to give an idea of the carefully comic portrayal of Thersagoras by Lucian. Perhaps the narrator, or Lucian-Lycinus, is not so astringent as in other dialogues, but he performs some neat surgery on Thersagoras' inflated ego, and prods home some telling thrusts. In the latter part of the piece, the dialogue between Archias and Antipater is well sustained and entertaining. The praises of Demosthenes by Philip are clever reminiscences of the orator's own speeches, a typical Lucian technique.[15]

It is false to regard the whole dialogue as just an encomium of Demosthenes' patriotism. This theme is dominant in the Archias-Antipater section, but is of very slight importance in the Thersagoras discussion.[16] The tone of this latter is essentially literary. The two protagonists are literary men of contrasting type. Thersagoras' naïve enthusiasms, his belief in poetic inspiration,[17] and the efficacy of praying to statues, are well contrasted with the scepticism of the hard-bitten rhetorician-narrator. This latter is contemptuous, both of his own juvenile encomium of Demosthenes, and of contemporary efforts on this theme. This literary chit-chat lends an air of realism to the characters. As an Homeric poet, Thersagoras is well versed in current Homeric scholarship, which was bedevilled with pedantic absurdities. For such topics as the birthplace, parents, and age of Homer, Thersagoras has a very Lucianic scorn.[18] In his turn, the narrator comments on the dearth of original compositions for hymns to Aesculapius, and the lack of new plays.

Thersagoras' encomium is almost entirely devoted to the literary and oratorical merits of Demosthenes. He begins by comparing select passages of Homer and the orator, a method of approach for which little can be said. He then singles out special points in Demosthenes' technique for which he has an especial admiration.[19] The orator is next commended for his freedom of speech, and preferred to Homer for his greater dignity in rebuking Athenian apathy, and for maintaining the intensity of a Greek tragedy. Here Thersagoras seems to be attempting Aristotelian flights, but he does not cut a very convincing figure. More minute technical points follow, after which Demosthenes is favourably compared to other Attic orators. He

[15] See Lucian, *Bis accus.* 26, where Oratory begins her indictment of the Syrian renegade (Lucian himself) with a flurry of Demosthenic pastiches, grafting the first sentence of the *Third Olynthiac* to the first sentence of the *De corona.*

[16] It is mentioned only twice; once coupled with philosophy as the object of Demosthenes' veneration (§12), and once as a possible theme for a panegyricist, though it is implied that this is a last resort (§ 16).

[17] Lucian ridicules the idea of poetic inspiration in his *Hesiod* (a Lycinus dialogue).

[18] See Luc. *V.H.* 2.20, where the usual issues regarding Homer's birthplace, and the like, are ridiculed in a discussion between the narrator of the adventure and Homer himself.

[19] These points are listed in § 6; they include: emotional passages; descriptive passages; figures of speech; devices to relieve monotony; resumptions after digressions; elegant comparisons; avoidance of barbarisms. This is highly technical criticism and, at times, obviously strained.

is then praised for his diligence in study, his declaiming aloud, and his lucubrations for the sake of winning fame as an orator.[20]

Thersagoras' laudation is an exercise in literary criticism; Sandys' generalizing label must be rejected. It is the Archias-Antipater section which deals with the patriotism issue. Thus, the whole work falls into two balancing divisions. However, the two halves are interrelated. Thersagoras allows his patriotism as a possible theme; likewise, his oratorical abilities are stressed in the Archias-Antipater section.[21] Hence it is quite artificial, and opposed to the construction of the work as a whole, to single out patriotism as the dominant motif. The entire work is an integrated and balanced appreciation of the man and his work, his oratory and his policies. Quite rightly, these are treated as connecting themes.

Having urged the authenticity and merits of the piece, it is incumbent upon us to show how it can be interpreted in the context of Lucian's other writing, and of his age. Is it a mere rhetorical exercise? Has it any links with similar contemporary works? What relation has it to second-century views on Demosthenes as orator and patriot? I should say, at this stage, that I do not follow Bauer in regarding the piece as primarily a satirical caricature of contemporary encomia. I would agree with Macleod[22] that Bauer is often too ingenious, for instance in his suggestion that Lucian deliberately makes the speakers guilty of bad Greek and grotesque claims.[23]

Of all the Attic orators mentioned by Lucian in his other works, Demosthenes appears most frequently. The researches of Householder[24] establish this not very surprising fact. For example, he is hailed as the perfect husband for Oratory, and as the best pupil of Paideia. Zeus is made to praise him as a 'wonderful' speaker, and points to his current status as a hackneyed topic for the wretched orators of the second century. He is condemned as 'graceless' by the *Rhetorum praeceptor*, and is put forward as a typical model for the old-fashioned type of orator (i.e. Lucian himself) in this same work.[25] Demosthenes is really the only Attic orator on whom Lucian lavishes any great amount of technical discussion. His allusions to other notables hardly concern their actual oratory. It is also manifest that Lucian is far more

[20] See § 14. Demosthenes' acquired attributes are: speech based on careful thought and language; persuasive argumentation; grandeur of style; strong lung-power; notable skill and care in selection of words and thoughts; versatility in his tropes. All these qualities are very reminiscent of the regimen prescribed by the 'old orator' (Lucian himself) in *Rhet. praec.* 9-10.

[21] Antipater praises his power and logodaedaly. Philip stresses his integrity and his ability to arouse his audiences.

[22] Op. cit. p. 237.

[23] Although few moderns are able to accept the existence of the Macedonian 'memoirs'. This is a difficult point. Is the motif of such a dubious volume satirical? Since it is Thersagoras who produces the book, though 'not without difficulty' (§ 27), we might be tempted to take it as such. After all, Lucian ridicules the follies of a bibliophile in his *Adv. indoct.*; but the narrator of our present piece accepts Thersagoras' volume without any further comment on its authenticity. It may be pertinent to compare *Adv. indoct.* 4, where alleged manuscripts of Demosthenes, in the orator's own hand, are spoken of as great treasures.

[24] F. W. Householder, Jnr., *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian* (Columbia, 1941).

[25] The key references for Lucian on Demosthenes are: *Bis accus.* 31; *Somn.* 12; *Jup. trag.* 14, 15, 23; *De merc. cond.* 5, 25; *Rhet. praec.* 10, 17; *Adv. indoct.* 4; *Paras.* 56.

interested in the later Attic orators than the early ones, and can scarcely be said to abide by any fixed Canon of Ten Attic Orators.[26]

Lucian's interest in Demosthenes may be taken to indicate that he was a likely person to compose a dialogue on this orator. His interest, though obviously genuine, is quite conventional for his age. A glance at the relevant writers, both Latin and Greek, confirms this. Fronto seems interested only in Lysias and Demosthenes;[27] Gellius has many of the usual anecdotes about Demosthenes' life, but only one genuine reference to his oratory.[28] Apuleius has a single reference to Demosthenes, praising him as *primarium dicendi artificem.*[29] These *testimonia* seem to indicate that the Attic orators were chiefly known to small critical factions by small portions of their writings and by anecdotes that were virtually *loci communes.*[30] The Greek writers of the period display a similar characteristic. To Hermogenes of Tarsus, the most important technical critic of the period, Demosthenes is the perfect model.[31] The trend is also apparent in the grammatical and pedantic 'rules' of such critics as Phrynichus, Moeris (if he is to be assigned to this period) and the mysterious *Antiatticistes.*[32] Householder[33] worked out a comparative table for Lucian and a composite group of fourteen Imperial authors, showing the relative frequency of their citations of Attic orators; in all these authorities Demosthenes emerges as the principal figure.

In addition to the above, there are two relatively obscure papyri from Oxyrhynchus which add to the picture.[34] Both are anonymous, and badly mutilated, but show the sort of rubbish produced about Demosthenes in the period, the sort of thing against which Lucian, I believe, was contending in the *Demosthenis encomium.*

The first of these papyri is in poor shape; the first twelve and last ten lines are unintelligible. The middle section can be summarized. It begins with an unfavourable comparison of Demosthenes to an unnamed orator. Its point is that Demosthenes is urging the Athenians to war, with much rodomontade about fighting Philip, but he himself has never been on active

[26] Of the other orators, Lucian really only refers to Isaeus, Isocrates, and Aeschines for their oratory proper, though the allusions are casual. Of the older orators, Pericles receives the most detailed discussion. Householder's statistics indicate a distinct preference for the later orators.

[27] See Fronto, ed. Haines (Loeb Library), Vol. i, pp. 21, 43, for allusions to Lysias; Demosthenes is praised as the perfect orator (ibid. p. 29).

[28] Gell. x 19, praises Demosthenes for using 'lepidis et venustis vocum modis'.

[29] *Apol.* 15.

[30] For example, Lysias owes much to the Platonic criticism of him for his continued fame; Aeschines seems to have been known chiefly thorugh his *Timarchus.*

[31] Hermogenes styles Demosthenes as *τῷ κορυφαίῳ* at p. 396.26 Rabe.

[32] Phrynichus and Moeris, however, tended to prefer the older Attic writers. This, in view of the absurd and often ignorant dogmatism of these critics, may have persuaded Lucian to prefer the later writers. In this, he had an ally in the *Antiatticistes* (whatever the date of this enigmatic figure). The statistics for the latter's references to Attic orators are remarkable. They are: Antiphon (7 references); Andocides (1); Lysias (10); Isaeus (0); Demosthenes (40); Hyperides (14); Isocrates (12); Aeschines (0); Lycurgus (0); Dinarchus (1).

[33] Op. cit., pp. 41-5. It should be noted that Householder does not include Phrynichus in his findings.

[34] *P.Oxy.* 858 (Grenfell-Hunt, Vol. vi., pp. 164-7); *P.Oxy.* 1799 (Grenfell-Hunt, Vol. xv, pp. 135-6).

service. Then the subject changes to the capture of Elateia, and the speaker denounces Demosthenes' behaviour on the arrival of this news at Athens.

In their commentary, Grenfell and Hunt make out a good case for regarding this piece as a rhetorical confection, not a genuine speech. They point out that it presupposes the *De Corona*, yet includes events prior to Chaeronea. The piece seems florid and staccato in the Asianic style; it contains the word δημηγόρος which seems foreign to Attic oratory; a serious ignorance of Attic law is apparent in its belief that the *boule* fixed the list of speakers for the *ecclesia*. Yet the piece does possess a certain vigour and crudely effective sarcasm. For example, Demosthenes is described as having 'sword in one hand, decree in the other'. Again, he is ridiculed for never having used a weapon, although his father was a sword manufacturer.

I am not claiming that Lucian wrote the *Demosthenis encomium* as a direct answer to this particular production, since we do not know the precise date of the latter. However, I would maintain that it represents the type of anti-Demosthenes writing he loathed. Many points of detail come close. Lucian would certainly have been offended by the historical muddle of the piece, and appalled by its ignorance of Attic terminology.[35] The anti-Demosthenic spirit is an obvious contrast. Lucian makes Antipater condemn the pro-Macedonian orators as selfish demagogues. The attack on his lack of military experience is turned into a compliment by Philip who says it was well for the Athenians that they kept him safe at home and gave the command to others. The slighting contrast to men such as Themistocles and Pericles in the papyrus is also reversed by Lucian in the orator's favour. A point of resemblance is that both pieces create their effect by pastiches of Demosthenes' own speeches; this technique is quite a favourite of Lucian, and may be taken as a further argument in support of the authenticity of the *Demosthenis encomium*.[36]

The second papyrus is even more fragmentary; only the second column of some twenty-five lines offers any real idea of the piece. It appears to be a vindication, albeit of indifferent merit, of Demosthenes' policies. Athens would have avoided disaster, had she followed his advice. Grenfell and Hunt assign the context of the piece to the post-Chaeronea period. There is some talk of Macedonian martial qualities, contrasted to Athenian weakness. A reference to the ancient history of Athens probably led up to a laudation of her past glories, but here the papyrus ceases to be intelligible. We can see points of detail which relate to Lucian's piece. Philip, in the latter, is made to vindicate Demosthenes' policies, and also to castigate Athenian weakness. The papyrus allusion to Athens' past probably alludes to Demosthenes' celebrated habit of invoking the men of Marathon; this motif occurs three times in the Lucian piece.

I believe that these two papyri establish the context of Lucian's dialogue.

[35] On this matter, see Householder, 'Mock Decrees in Lucian', *TAPhA* lxxi (1940), 199-216.

[36] In Luc. *Jup. trag.* 14 Hermes remarks that most people now make speeches which are little more than close reworkings of Demosthenes' *Philippics*. Zeus replies by saying that this device is useful for those who don't know what to say. A glance at Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* shows that the favourite themes based on Demosthenes were to the discredit of the orator. Yet the same authority (*V.S.* i 25) relates that Herodes Atticus was hailed at Olympia with the cry 'You are a very Demosthenes'.

We have already noted that Lucian refers to the second-century habit of using the Demosthenes theme, both in the dialogue under discussion and elsewhere. Lucian was, I think, disgusted by the cheap anti-Demosthenic exercises then current, and wearied by the many platitudinous encomia on him which were circulating; these turned him against his own early efforts in this field, and led him to compose the present work. He is openly pro-Demosthenes, which is precisely what we would expect, judging by his references and allusions in his other works. However, his encomium is written in a reasoned and critical spirit; Demosthenes' oratorical techniques are analysed along with his political principles. The Archias-Antipater section does become cloying in sentiment; this, however, is not an argument one way or the other.

To conclude: the *Demosthenis encomium* is a genuine product of Lucian's pen. The objections to it can all be rebutted. Its Greek style is by no means as inferior as Helm would have it. The avoidance of hiatus seems to fit the subject and mood of the piece, even if it is taken to excess. The piece is not just a eulogy on patriotism. It contains the comic character of Thersagoras, the usual sardonic narrator, and a good deal of discussion of literary topics quite in the Lucian vein. I would agree that the piece is not the sharpest Lucianic satire, and repeat that I do not follow the subtle interpretation of Bauer. The piece fits perfectly into the context of second-century discussions and reworkings of the Demosthenes theme. For Lucian, deeply immersed in the Atticist and literary polemics of the day, a man who had moved from conventional rhetoric to satiric dialogues but whose entire work reflects a close interest in later Attic oratory in general, and Demosthenes in particular, nothing seems less surprising than that he should contribute a dialogue, favourable in spirit, on the subject of Demosthenes.

LIII

THE EPIGRAMS OF LUCIAN

All but one of the fifty-three epigrams ascribed to Lucian derive from the Greek Anthology;[1] the exception is the first one (*On his Own Book*), cited by Photius and possessing slight manuscript authority.[2] And, as will be seen, the total number of attributed epigrams has been whittled down considerably by Paton and other commentators on the Anthology.[3]

Reaction to the merits of these little pieces is entirely subjective. MacLeod, Lucian's most recent editor, dubs the first epigram "spurious"; of the others, he allows that "at least a few are not un-Lucianic in style and thought," but does not elaborate (523–525). Bompaire, who made an effort to correlate some of the epigrams with Lucian's other work, states the only reasonable general approach (646): "On pourrait se fonder sur les talents de poète de Lucien pour lui attribuer les Épigrammes, généralement tenues pour apocryphes. Certaines sont fort proches par l'esprit du reste de l'oeuvre. Mais l'appréciation est subjective et l'on n'a pas le droit, dans l'état présent des recherches, de se prononcer."

Unexceptionable sentiments. Hence, it seems worthwhile to collect the poems together (providing collation with the *A.P.* numbers), and to examine their style and themes within the joint framework of Lucian's other work and the Anthology as a whole.

The poems run as follows:[4]

[1]The following works will be cited by author's name: J. Bompaire, *Lucien Écrivain* (Paris 1958); A. S. F. Gow and D. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965, "Gow-Page, *HE*" below); and *The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge 1968, "Gow-Page, *GP*" below); C. Jacobitz, *Luciani Opera, ed. maior* 4 (Leipzig 1841); G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Leipzig 1878); M. D. MacLeod, *Lucian* 8 (London 1967, Loeb); Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen*[3] (Braunschweig 1884); W. Paton, *The Greek Anthology* (London 1916–1918, Loeb); W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* 1. Grab-Epigramme (Berlin 1955); C. Reitz, *Lexicon Lucianeum* (Amsterdam 1746); also the papers by G. Giangrande, "Sympotic Literature and Epigram," J. Labarbe, "Aspects gnomiques de l'épigramme grecque," G. Luck, "Witz und Sentiment im griechischen Epigramm," and L. Robert, "Les épigrammes satiriques de Lucillius sur les athlètes: parodie et réalités," in *L'Épigramme Grecque* (Entretiens Hardt 14, Geneva 1968).

[2]Photius, *Bibliotheca* (*Cod.* 128); see MacLeod 523–525.

[3]Paton allowed 37 epigrams to Lucian; one or two more are left as possibilities (details will emerge in subsequent parts of this article).

[4]Text after Jacobitz. MacLeod prints only *Epigram* 1; the rest are of course in editions of the Anthology.

1.

Λουκιανὸς τάδ' ἔγραψα παλαιά τε μωρά τε εἰδώς,
μωρὰ γὰρ ἀνθρώποις καὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα σοφά.
οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι διακριδόν ἐστι νόημα,
ἀλλ' ὃ σὺ θαυμάζεις, τοῦθ' ἑτέροισι γέλως.

2.

Τὸν πατρικὸν πλοῦτον νέος ὢν Θήρων ὁ Μενίππου
αἰσχρῶς εἰς ἀκρατεῖς ἐξέχεεν δαπάνας.
ἀλλά μιν Εὐκτήμων, πατρικὸς φίλος, ὡς ἐνόησεν
ἤδη καρφαλέῃ τειρόμενον πενίῃ,
καί μιν δακρυχέων ἀνελάμβανε καὶ πόσιν αὐτὸν
θῆκε θυγατρὸς ἑῆς πόλλ' ἐπὶ μείλια δούς.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Θήρωνι παρ' ἐλπίδας ἦλυθε πλοῦτος,
αὐτίκα ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐτρέφετ' ἐν δαπάναις
γαστρὶ χαριζόμενος πᾶσαν χάριν, οὐ κατὰ κόσμον,
τῇ θ' ὑπὸ τὴν μιαρὰν γαστέρα μαργοσύνῃ.
οὕτως μὲν Θήρωνα τὸ δεύτερον ἀμφεκάλυψεν
οὐλομένης πενίης κῦμα παλιρρόθιον.
Εὐκτήμων δ' ἐδάκρυσε τὸ δεύτερον, οὐκέτι κεῖνον,
ἀλλὰ θυγατρὸς ἑῆς προῖκά τε καὶ θάλαμον.
ἔγνω δ' ὡς οὐκ ἔστι κακῶς κεχρημένον ἄνδρα
τοῖς ἰδίοις εἶναι πιστὸν ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις.

3.

Ὡς τεθνηξόμενος τῶν σῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπόλανε,
ὡς δὲ βιωσόμενος φείδεο σῶν κτεάνων.
ἔστι δ' ἀνὴρ σοφὸς οὗτος, ὃς ἄμφω ταῦτα νοήσας
φειδοῖ καὶ δαπάνῃ μέτρον ἐφηρμόσατο.

4.

Θνητὰ τὰ τῶν θνητῶν καὶ πάντα παρέρχεται ἡμᾶς·
ἢν δὲ μή, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς αὐτὰ παρερχόμεθα.

5.

Τοῖσι μὲν εὖ πράττουσιν ἅπας ὁ βίος βραχύς ἐστι,
τοῖς δὲ κακῶς μία νὺξ ἄπλετός ἐστι χρόνος.

6.

Οὐχ ὁ Ἔρως ἀδικεῖ μερόπων γένος, ἀλλ' ἀκολάστοις
ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἔσθ' ὁ Ἔρως πρόφασις.

7.

Ὠκεῖαι χάριτες γλυκερώτεραι· ἢν δὲ βραδύνῃ,
πᾶσα χάρις κενεή, μηδὲ λέγοιτο χάρις.

8.

Φαῦλος ἀνὴρ πίθος ἐστὶ τετρημένος, εἰς ὃν ἁπάσας
ἀντλῶν τὰς χάριτας εἰς κενὸν ἐξέχεας.

9.

Ἀνθρώπους μὲν ἴσως λήσεις ἄτοπόν τι ποιήσας·
οὐ λήσεις δὲ θεούς, οὐδὲ λογιζόμενος.

10.

Οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι φύσις χαλεπώτερον εὗρεν
ἀνθρώπου καθαρὰν ψευδομένου φιλίην.
οὐ γὰρ ἔθ' ὡς ἐχθρὸν προφυλασσόμεθ', ἀλλ' ἀγαπῶντες
ὡς φίλον ἐν τούτῳ πλείονα βλαπτόμεθα.

11.

Ἀρρήτων ἐπέων γλώσσῃ σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω·
κρείσσων γὰρ μύθων ἡ κτεάνων φυλακή.

12.

Πλοῦτος ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς πλοῦτος μόνος ἐστὶν ἀληθής,
τἆλλα δ' ἔχει λύπην πλείονα τῶν κτεάνων.
τὸν δὲ πολυκτέανον καὶ πλούσιόν ἐστι δίκαιον
κλῄζειν, ὃς χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς δύναται.
εἰ δέ τις ἐν ψήφοις κατατήκεται ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ
σωρεύειν αἰεὶ πλοῦτον ἐπειγόμενος,
οὗτος ὁποῖα μέλισσα πολυτρήτοις ἐνὶ σίμβλοις
μοχθήσει, ἑτέρων δρεπτομένων τὸ μέλι.

13.

Ἀγρὸς Ἀχαιμενίδου γενόμην ποτέ, νῦν δὲ Μενίππου,
καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἑτέρου βήσομαι εἰς ἕτερον.
καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἔχειν μέ ποτ' ὤετο, καὶ πάλιν οὗτος
οἴεται, εἰμὶ δ' ὅλως οὐδενός, ἀλλὰ Τύχης.

14.

Εὖ πράττων φίλος εἶ θνητοῖς, φίλος εἶ μακάρεσσι,
καί σευ ῥηϊδίως ἔκλυον εὐξαμένου.
ἢν πταίσῃς, οὐδεὶς ἔτι σοι φίλος, ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντα
ἐχθρὰ Τύχης ῥιπαῖς συμμεταβαλλόμενα.

15.

Πολλὰ τὸ δαιμόνιον δύναται, κἂν ᾖ παράδοξα,
τοὺς μικροὺς ἀνάγει, τοὺς μεγάλους κατάγει.
καὶ σοῦ τὴν ὀφρὺν καὶ τὸν τῦφον καταπαύσει,
κἂν ποταμὸς χρυσοῦ νάματά σοι παρέχῃ.
οὐ θρύον, οὐ μαλάχην ἄνεμός ποτε, τὰς δὲ μεγίστας
ἢ δρύας ἢ πλατάνους οἶδε χαμαὶ κατάγειν.

16.

Ἡ βραδύπους βουλὴ μέγ' ἀμείνων, ἡ δὲ ταχεῖα
αἰὲν ἐφελκομένη τὴν μετάνοιαν ἔχει.

17.

Ἔξ ὧραι μόχθοις ἱκανώταται, αἳ δὲ μετ' αὐτὰς
γράμμασι δεικνύμεναι ζῆθι λέγουσι βροτοῖς.

18.

Εἰ ταχὺς εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν καὶ πρὸς δρόμον ἀμβλὺς ὑπάρχεις,
τοῖς ποσί σου τρῶγε καὶ τρέχε τῷ στόματι.

19.

Εἰς τί μάτην νίπτεις δέμας Ἰνδικόν; ἴσχεο τέχνης,
οὐ δύνασαι δνοφερὴν νύκτα καθηλιάσαι.

20.

Οἱ συναγωνισταὶ τὸν πυγμάχον ἐνθάδ' ἔθηκαν
Ἄπιν, οὐδένα γὰρ πώποτ' ἐτραυμάτισεν.

21.

Πᾶσαν ὅσαν Ἕλληνες ἀγωνοθετοῦσιν ἄμιλλαν
πυγμῆς, Ἀνδρόλεως πᾶσαν ἀγωνισάμαν.
ἔσχον δ' ἐν Πίσῃ μὲν ἓν ὠτίον, ἐν δὲ Πλαταιαῖς
ἓν βλέφαρον· Πυθοῖ δ' ἄπνοος ἐκφέρομαι.
Δαμοτέλης δ' ὁ πατὴρ καρύσσετο σὺν πολιήταις
ἀραί με σταδίων ἢ νεκρὸν ἢ κολοβόν.

22.

Ἴλαθι Γραμματικὴ φυσίζοε, ἴλαθι λιμοῦ,
φάρμακον εὑρομένα "μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά."
ἐχρῆν νηὸν καὶ σοὶ περικαλλέα δωμήσασθαι
καὶ βωμὸν θυέων μήποτε δευόμενον.
καὶ γὰρ σοῦ μεσταὶ μὲν ὁδοί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
καὶ λιμένες, πάντων δέκτρια Γραμματική.

23.

Δαίμονα πολλὰ λαλῶν ὀζόστομος ἐξορκιστὴς
ἐξέβαλ' οὐχ ὅρκων ἀλλὰ κόπρων δυνάμει.

24.

Οὔτε Χίμαιρα τοιοῦτον ἔπνει κακὸν ἡ καθ' Ὅμηρον,
οὐκ ἀγέλη ταύρων, ὡς ὁ λόγος, πυρίπνους,
οὐ Λῆμνος σύμπασα καὶ Ἀρπυιῶν τὰ περισσὰ
οὐδ' ὁ Φιλοκτήτου ποῦς ἀποσηπόμενος.
ὥστε σε παμψηφεὶ νικᾶν, Τελέσιλλα, Χιμαίρας,
σηπεδόνας, ταύρους, ὄρνεα, Λημνιάδας.

25.

Ποιητὴς ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἴσθμια πρὸς τὸν ἀγῶνα
εὑρὼν ποιητὰς εἶπε παρίσθμι' ἔχειν.
μέλλει δ' ἐξορμᾶν εἰς Πύθια· κἂν πάλιν εὕρῃ,
εἰπεῖν οὐ δύναται, καὶ παραπύθι' ἔχω.

26.

Εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένῳ, Κυλλήνιε, πῶς κατέβαινεν
Λολλιανοῦ ψυχὴ δῶμα τὸ Φερσεφόνης;
θαῦμα μέν, εἰ σιγῶσα· τυχὸν δέ τι καί σε διδάσκειν
ἤθελε· φεῦ, κείνου καὶ νέκυν ἀντιάσαι.

27.

Τὸν τοῦ δειπναρίου νόμον οἴδατε· σήμερον ὑμᾶς,
Αὖλε, καλῶ καινοῖς δόγμασι συμποσίου.
οὐ μελοποιὸς ἐρεῖ κατακείμενος, οὔτε παρέξεις
οὔθ' ἕξεις αὐτὸς πράγματα γραμματικά.

28.

Παῖδά με πενταέτηρον ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντα
νηλειὴς Ἀΐδης ἥρπασε Καλλίμαχον.
ἀλλά με μὴ κλαίοις· καὶ γὰρ βιότοιο μετέσχον
παύρου καὶ παύρων τῶν βιότοιο κακῶν.

29.

Ἠχὼ πετρήεσσαν ὀρῇς, φίλε, Πανὸς ἑταίρην,
ἀντίτυπον φθογγὴν ἔμπαλιν ἀδομένην,
παντοίων στομάτων λάλον εἰκόνα, ποιμέσιν ἡδὺ
παίγνιον· ὅσσα λέγεις, ταῦτα κλύων ἄπιθι.

30.

Τὴν Παφίην γυμνὴν οὐδεὶς ἴδεν· εἰ δέ τις εἶδεν,
οὗτος ὁ τὴν γυμνὴν στησάμενος Παφίην.

31.

Σοὶ μορφῆς ἀνέθηκα τεῆς περικαλλὲς ἄγαλμα,
Κύπρι, τεῆς μορφῆς φέρτερον οὐδὲν ἔχων.

32.

Εἰς τὸ κενόν με τέθεικε νόμον χάριν ὧδε Πρίηπον
Εὐτυχίδης, ξηρῶν κληματίδων φύλακα.
καὶ περιβέβλημαι κρημνὸν βαθύν. ὃς δ' ἂν ἐπέλθῃ,
οὐδὲν ἔχει κλέψαι πλὴν ἐμὲ τὸν φύλακα.

33.

Ἑλλάδα νικήσασαν ὑπέρβιον ἀσπίδα Μήδων
Λαΐς θῆκεν ἑῷ κάλλεϊ ληϊδίην.
μούνῳ ἐνικήθη δ' ὑπὸ γήραϊ, καὶ τὸν ἔλεγχον
ἄνθετο σοί, Παφίη, τὸν νεότητι φίλον.
ἧς γὰρ ἰδεῖν στυγέει πολιῆς παναληθέα μορφήν,
τῆσδε συνεχθαίρει καὶ σκιόεντα τύπον.

34.

Γλαύκῳ καὶ Νηρῇϊ καὶ Ἰνοῖ καὶ Μελικέρτῃ
καὶ βυθίῳ Κρονίδῃ καὶ Σαμόθρᾳξι θεοῖς
σωθεὶς ἐκ πελάγους Λουκίλλιος ὧδε κέκαρμαι
τὰς τρίχας ἐκ κεφαλῆς· ἄλλο γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔχω.

35.

Ἐν πᾶσιν μεθύουσιν Ἀκίνδυνος ἤθελε νήφειν,
τοὔνεκα καὶ μεθύειν αὐτὸς ἔδοξε μόνος.

36.

Ἔσβεσε τὸν λύχνον μῶρος ψυλλῶν ὑπὸ πολλῶν
δακνόμενος λέξας· οὐκέτι με βλέπετε.

37.

Ἦν ἐσίδῃς κεφαλὴν μαδαρὰν καὶ στέρνα καὶ ὤμους,
μηδὲν ἐρωτήσῃς, μωρὸν ὁρᾷς φαλακρόν.

38.

Τὴν κεφαλὴν βάπτεις, γῆρας δὲ σὸν οὔποτε βάψεις,
οὐδὲ παρειάων ἐκτανύσεις ῥυτίδας.

μὴ τοίνυν τὸ πρόσωπον ἅπαν ψιμύθῳ κατάπλαττε,
ὥστε προσωπεῖον κοὐχὶ πρόσωπον ἔχειν.
οὐδὲν γὰρ πλέον ἐστί. τί μαίνεαι; οὔποτε φῦκος
καὶ ψίμυθος τεύξει τὴν Ἑκάβην Ἑλένην.

39.

Οὐδέποτ' εἰς πορθμεῖον ὁ κηλήτης Διόφαντος
ἐμβαίνει μέλλων εἰς τὸ πέραν ἀπίναι.
τῆς κήλης δ' ἐπάνωθι τὰ φορτία πάντα τεθεικὼς
καὶ τὸν ὄνον διαπλεῖ σινδόν' ἐπαράμενος.
ὥστε μάτην Τρίτωνες ἐν ὕδασι δόξαν ἔχουσιν,
εἰ καὶ κηλήτης ταὐτὸ ποιεῖν δύναται.

40.

Ὁ γρυπὸς Νίκων ὀσφραίνεται οἴνου ἄριστα,
οὐ δύναται δ' εἰπεῖν οἷος ἂν ᾖ ταχέως.
ἐν τρισὶν ὥραις γὰρ θεριναῖς μόλις αἰσθάνετ' αὐτὸς
ὡς ἂν ἔχων πηχῶν ῥῖνα διακοσίων.
ὦ μεγάλου μυκτῆρος, ὅταν ποταμὸν διαβαίνῃ,
θηρεύει τούτῳ πολλάκις ἰχθύδια.

41.

Ζωγράφε, τὰς μορφὰς κλέπτεις μόνον· οὐ δύνασαι δὲ
φωνὴν συλῆσαι χρώματι πειθομένην.

42.

Θαυμάζειν μοι ἔπεισιν, ὅπως Βύτος ἐστὶ σοφιστής,
οὔτε λόγον κοινὸν οὔτε λογισμὸν ἔχων.

43.

Θᾶττον ἔην λευκοὺς κόρακας πτηνάς τε χελώνας
εὑρεῖν ἢ δόκιμον ῥήτορα Καππαδόκην.

44.

Πολλὰς μυριάδας ψηφίζων Ἀρτεμίδωρος
καὶ μηδὲν δαπανῶν ζῇ βίον ἠμιόνων,
πολλάκις αἱ χρυσοῦ τιμαλφέα φόρτον ἔχουσαι
πολλὸν ὑπὲρ νώτου χόρτον ἔδουσι μόνον.

45.

Εἰ τὸ τρέφειν πώγωνα δοκεῖς σοφίαν περιποιεῖν,
καὶ τράγος εὐπώγων εὔστολός ἐστι Πλάτων.

46.

Τοῦ πωγωνοφόρου Κυνικοῦ τοῦ βακτροπροσαίτου
εἴδομεν ἐν δείπνῳ τὴν μεγάλην σοφίαν·
θέρμων μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον ἀπέσχετο καὶ ῥαφανίδων,
μὴ δεῖν δουλεύειν γαστρὶ λέγων ἀρετήν.
εὖτε δ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδεν χιονώδεα βόλβαν
στρυφνήν, ἣ πινυτὸν ἤδη ἔκλεπτε νόον·
ἤτησεν παρὰ προσδοκίαν καὶ ἔτρωγεν ἀληθῶς,
κοὐδὲν ἔφη βόλβαν τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀδικεῖν.

47.

Μισόπτωχε θεά, μούνη πλούτου δαμάτειρα,
ἣ τὸ καλῶς ζῆσαι πάντοτ' ἐπισταμένη·
εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀλλοτρίοις ἐπιϊζομένη ποσὶ χαίρεις,
ὁπλοφορεῖν τ' οἶδας καὶ μύρα σοι μέλεται,
τέρπει καὶ στέφανός σε καὶ Αὐσονίου πόμα Βάκχου.
ταῦτα παρὰ πτωχοῖς γίγνεται οὐδέποτε.
τοὔνεκά νυν φεύγεις πενίης τὸν ἀχάλκεον οὐδόν,
τέρπῃ δ' αὖ πλούτου πρὸς πόδας ἐρχομένη.

48.

Πολλάκις οἶνον ἔπεμψας ἐμοί, καὶ πολλάκις ἔγνων
σοὶ χάριν, ἡδυπότῳ νέκταρι τερπόμενος.
νῦν δ' εἴπερ με φιλεῖς, μὴ πέμψῃς· οὐ δέομαι γὰρ
οἴνου τοιούτου, μηκέτ' ἔχων θρίδακας.

49.

Αἱ τρισσαί τοι ταῦτα τὰ παίγνια θῆκαν ἑταῖραι,
Κύπρι μάκαιρ', ἄλλης ἄλλη ἀπ' ἐργασίης.
ὧν ἀπὸ μὲν πυγῆς Εὐφρὼ τάδε, ταῦτα δὲ Κλειώ,
ὡς θέμις· ἡ τριτάτη δ' Ἀθὶς ἀπ' οὐρανίων.
ἀνθ' ὧν τῇ μὲν πέμπε τὰ παιδικά, δεσπότι, κέρδη,
τῇ δὲ τὰ θηλείης, τῇ δὲ τὰ μηδετέρης.

50.

Μηδείς μοι ταύτην, Ἐρασίστρατε, τὴν σπατάλην σου
ποιήσειε θεῶν, ἣ σὺ κατασπαταλᾷς,
ἔσθων ἐκτραπέλως στομάχων κακά, χείρονα λιμοῦ,
οἷα φάγοιεν ἐμῶν ἀντιδίκων τεκνία.
πεινάσαιμι γὰρ αὖθις ἔτι πλέον, ἢ πρὶν ἐπείνων,
ἢ χορτασθείην τῆς παρὰ σοὶ σπατάλης.

51.

Αἱ τρίχες, ἢν σιγᾷς, εἰσὶ φρένες· ἢν δὲ λαλήσῃς,
ὡς αἱ τῆς ἤβης, οὐ φρένες, ἀλλὰ τρίχες.

52.

Ἰητήρ τις ἐμοὶ τὸν ἐὸν φίλον υἱὸν ἔπεμψεν,
ὥστε μαθεῖν παρ' ἐμοὶ ταῦτα τὰ γραμματικά.
ὡς δὲ τὸ μῆνιν ἄειδε καὶ ἄλγεα μυρί' ἔθηκεν
ἔγνω καὶ τὸ τρίτον τοῖσδ' ἀκόλουθον ἔπος,
πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν,
οὐκέτι μιν πέμπει πρός με μαθησόμενον.
ἀλλά μ' ἰδὼν ὁ πατήρ, σοὶ μὲν χάρις, εἶπεν, ἑταῖρε·
αὐτὰρ ὁ παῖς παρ' ἐμοὶ ταῦτα μαθεῖν δύναται.
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ πολλὰς ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προϊάπτω
καὶ πρὸς τοῦτ' οὐδὲν γραμματικοῦ δέομαι.

53.

* * * * * * *
ἀλλὰ σύ μοι προφέρεις τέκνιον ἀλλότριον
τὴν προτομὴν αὐτῷ περιθεὶς κυνός· ὥστε με καλεῖν,
πῶς μοι Ζωπυρίων ἐξ Ἑκάβης γέγονεν;
καὶ πέρας ἓξ δραχμῶν Ἐρασίστρατος ὁ κρεοπώλης
ἐκ τῶν Ἰσικίων υἱὸν Ἄνουβιν ἔχω.

1. As stated, this epigram derives from Photius' entry on Lucian. It could simply be an editorial comment, or a bookseller's "blurb." Apart from Photius' appreciation, the brief comments on Lucian by Eunapius, Lactantius, and Isidore of Pelusium (sharply contrasting, of course, with the diatribes of the *Suda*, Arethas, and the scholiasts!) are in the same vein.[5] It is true that Lucian hardly ever used his own name in his multifarious writings, preferring "Lycinus" or suitably self-flattering nicknames,[6] but the author's real name is to be expected in a poem prefixed to a collection of his works. It is not impossible that Lucian dashed off this epigram for the above purpose. The trouble is that it is usually dangerous to speak of publication in the modern sense in the context of ancient authors, and there is no evidence that Lucian ever supervised such a collection. However, there is also no evidence that he did not. If he did, then Galen's

[5]Eunapius *VS*, p. 454; Lactantius *Inst. Div.* 1.9; Isidore *Epist.* 4.55. Later *testimonia* are fully discussed in my *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto 1974).

[6]On this matter see Macleod 4; the dialogues in question are the disputed *Soloecista* and the *Piscator*.

experience with the fraudulent bibliopoles in the Sandalarium suggests that an author needed to be vigilant over his title page.[7]

The Anthology exhibits two similar poems, one ascribed to Theocritus, the other to Ignatius.[8] It is worth noting that, in the case of the Lucian epigram, the verb "wrote" is variously given by the manuscripts in the first or third person. In the Theocritus poem, this verb seems firmly established in the first person, whereas the equivalent verb is securely in the third person in the case of Ignatius. Not that the point establishes authorship of any of the three pieces, since either person can be used by the author with equal logic.

It should also be observed that the relatively infrequent adverb διακριδόν occurs in the Lucianic or pseudo-Lucianic *Amores*;[9] further, it is quite close in the latter passage to the noun νόσημα, which is striking in view of its proximity in the epigram to νόημα. A deliberate echo? And, if so, by what author? Or mere coincidence?

2 (= *A.P.* 9.367). The theme of this, the longest of the epigrams in question, is the extravagant misuse of wealth; it is quite appropriate to Lucian, but is an obvious commonplace in the Anthology (so Labarbe, 380–381). The introduction of Menippus looks a tempting clue, especially since the famous Cynic was credited with accumulating a large fortune through usury,[10] which would have given his son something to waste.

Actually, the name proves nothing: it is far too common. There is, for easy example, Menippus the geographer;[11] Cicero mentions a sophist who bore the name; a Menippus is mourned on a sepulchral inscription from Chios; and so on. The name also recurs in another of the Lucian epigrams, attached to the owner of a field.[12]

More to the point, perhaps, is the greedy catamite Menippus who is attacked for his rapacity in an epigram by Callimachus (*A.P.* 12.148). Giangrande, in his detailed analysis of the poem, sees the use of the name as a deliberately ironic pointer to the reputation of the Cynic (136–139).

[7] *De Suis Libris* 1 (= 19.8K.); or the Teubner *Galeni scripta minora* (Teubner 1891—reprinted in 1967), vol. 2, 5. For the possibility of ancient, even Lucianic, collection of Lucian's works, see MacLeod (with L. R. Wickham) in *CQ* 20 (1970) 297–299; and MacLeod on the text of the *De Calumnia* in vol. 1 of his *OCT* (1972).

[8] *A.P.* 9.434 (15.39); see Gow's note (on the former) in his *Theocritus* 2 (Cambridge 1950) 549–550, indicating that an identical argument over authorship of this piece has a considerable history.

[9] *Amores* 3. Guyet read διάκριτον; but see Kaibel 1028.14.

[10] Diogenes Laertius 6.99. His "biography" claims that the Cynic hanged himself after he had been robbed; the tragedy is heightened by the fact that it moved Diogenes to compose some of his execrable verses on the subject.

[11] Addressed by Crinagoras in *A.P.* 9.559; see the note of Gow-Page, *GP* 2.243.

[12] *Brutus* 91.315; Kaibel, 302; *Ep.* 13 (= *A.P.* 9.74).

This is important. The mercenary catamite is a commonplace in epigrams.[13] Also, Theron (Menippus' son in the Lucian poem) recurs from time to time in the Anthology (especially in Strato's *Musa Puerilis*) as a catamite.[14] The Lucian epigram draws on a common stock of names and themes. The poem is a serious exercise, not a skit; the introduction of the final moral by ὡς conforms to the stylistic norm.[15]

The third character in the epigram is Euctemon, who gives his daughter and a large dowry to Theron. The name is common enough (cf. Pape-Benseler), and the Euctemon who was the satellite of Meidias is mentioned in the *Demosthenis Encomium*.[16] Interestingly enough, a Euctemon features in an epigram by Lucillius (*A.P.* 11.393). He suffers from a hydrocele, but is consoled by the poet, who assures him that a daughter is a greater burden, one which he would cheerfully exchange for a hundred hydroceles. Hydrocele jokes occur elsewhere in the Anthology: in one case in an epigram ascribed to Lucian (*Ep.* 39). All this is further demonstration of the recurrence and interrelation of names and themes throughout the Anthology. It may be subjoined that Lucian and Lucillius vie for the authorship (no great prize!) of several of the epigrams in question, as we shall see.

Such particularities will crop up again and again in discussion of other epigrams. They are not conclusive of anything. The recurrent names obviously cannot and will not be correlated with individual characters. They make a useful contribution to the understanding of the framework and conventions of the epigram, and may sometimes hint at the author of a particular poem: that is all. A general discussion of the basic question of Lucianic authorship is reserved for the conclusion of this paper. But it may as well be admitted now that such details are not going to decide anything certain.

Nor will points of style. There is, for example, some parallel to the phraseology of line 2 of the present epigram in Lucian's *Timon* 55. The noun μαργοσύνη (line 10) seems not to occur elsewhere in Lucian, nor does the adjective καρφαλέος (line 4), though it is found in other poets of the Anthology.[17] Such phenomena are worth remarking, but what do they prove? Lucian could have rehashed the *Timon* phrase in an epigram, or *vice versa*. Or another poet could have liked the phrase and reworked it. Words not found elsewhere in Lucian might indicate that they are ones

[13]Giangrande cites *A.P.* 5.113; 11.320; 12.42, 44, 212.

[14]See, e.g., 12.41, 60, 95.

[15]Labarbe, 375, compares *A.P.* 11.425 to the present poem.

[16]*Dem.Enc.* 48; see my article, "The Authorship and Purpose of Lucian's *Demosthenis Encomium*," *Antichthon* 3 (1969) 54–62.

[17]They are absent, at least, from Reitz and from Jacobitz' *Index Graecus*. The former word was used by Anacreon and Theognis. The latter occurs in *A.P.* 9.272 (Bianor); 9.384 (Anonymous).

he did not care for, thus suggesting that the epigram is not from his pen. Alternatively, it is perfectly possible that there are words which a writer, consciously or otherwise, uses only once in his literary career. One's verdict is bound to be influenced by what one conceives of as valid stylometry (and, nowadays, by what one thinks of computer-determined authorship), but no agreed solution will be reached through such approaches.

3 (= *A.P.* 10.26). The theme of thrift or moderation can obviously be related to the previous one; it is equally a commonplace. Thematically, it can be connected with *Epigram* 12 in the collection, which is tolerably striking since there is one small flourish of style common to the two pieces: the emphatic use of οὗτος to point the moral. This detail might suggest that both poems are by the same author, whoever he was. Yet even that modest proposal is risky, for the usage is found elsewhere in the Anthology.[18] The paraenetic opening of the present poem is paralleled in *Epigram* 11, but is far too widespread to prove anything (see Labarbe 375).

It may be more notable that *Epigrams* 3, 11, and 12 contain the only Lucianic uses (apart from a mock oracle in *Alexander* 24) of κτέανον listed by Reitz and Jacobitz. In each case, the word is in the second line of the poem, always in the genitive plural; it is the last word in the line in two passages, penultimate in the other. Does this denote common authorship (Lucianic or otherwise), or common metrical convenience within the couplet form?[19] Word-breaks after fourth spondees, like the one in line 3, are excessively rare (if we exclude cases where the foot ends in a prospective monosyllable); see Gow-Page xliv—no examples in *GP*, three in *HE*. Would Lucian's metric be so wilful? (See also *Ep.* 44.)

4 (= *A.P.* 10.31). There is little worth saying about this fragment of "cracker-barrel philosophy." Lucian could have written it; so could hundreds of others. The opening is reminiscent of Pindar's θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει, but many a later writer could have adapted this quotable phrase to the hackneyed sentiment (see Labarbe 376 f.).

5 (= *A.P.* 10.28). The previous comment obtains. The sentiment is widespread (Labarbe 377), and the language unremarkable, save that the adjective ἄπλετος is nowhere else registered by Reitz or Jacobitz.

[18]For the flourish, Labarbe 356; for the parallel, *A.P.* 7.574 (Agathias Scholasticus).

[19]See other examples in Kaibel, 118.4 = Peek, *GV* 1007 (genitive plural at end of line); 388.4 (accusative singular, penultimate position); 776.4 (genitive plural, in middle of line); 1064.12 (genitive plural, second word in line).

6 (= *A.P.* 10.29). Lucian liked to make jokes on sexual themes,[20] but did not usually moralize on love and lust. This epigram seems unlikely to be by him, but Lucian is not notable for consistency and he was certainly capable of writing to a patron's order. The Homeric-sounding μέροψ occurs in *Tragodopodagra* 50.

7 (= *A.P.* 10.30). Paton designated this as an anonymous poem. It should perhaps be connected with the following:

8 (= *A.P.* 9.120). The two cohere in theme and language, and both might be by the same author. The conceit of pouring into an empty jar occurs (with great similarity of language) in *Dial. Mort.* 11.4 (in the context of the daughters of Danaus). It is also found in *Timon* 18 (on the lips of Wealth, the speaker in the dialogue). The significance of these parallels is subject to the aforementioned limitations, and the image may be found in earlier authors, e.g., Theophrastos, *Characters* 20, but I incline for subjective reasons to accept *Epigram* 8 as genuine, leaving the authorship of *Epigram* 7 as unprovable. This is one of four poems ascribed to Lucian which share the extremely rare licence of *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break. Gow-Page, *GP* 1 xli n. 1, admit four cases in *HE* and none in *GP*. Four occurrences in our 217 lines is hardly a coincidence, and suggests unity of authorship for the poems involved: 18, 42, 46 (cf. R. Aubreton, *Anthologie Palatine* 10 [Paris 1972, Budé] 40 n. 9) and this poem.

9 (= *A.P.* 10.27). The religious sentiment is alien to Lucian, though my earlier *caveat* concerning his willingness to write to order should always be kept in mind.

10 (= *A.P.* 10.36). Another commonplace (Labarbe 381). *A.P.* 10.121 is a close verbal parallel. The thought has something in common with *Epigram* 14 (Labarbe), and perhaps with *Calumnia* 14, where friendships are pessimistically viewed as vulnerable to slander. *Navigium* 39 makes the common Lucianic point that rich men and tyrants have only false friends; *Demonax* 10 praises that philosopher for regarding friendship as the greatest of boons. Lucian, of course, consecrated his dialogue *Toxaris* to the theme of friendship, but one cannot help remembering that Cicero was writing about this virtue at the time of the *Second Philippic*! All in all, however, the epigram could be authentic.

[20] A glance at the *Index Nominum* in H. Licht's *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece* (London 1932) will indicate the frequence of sexual passages in Lucian, though it will be kept in mind that the major sexual pieces (*Amores*, *Asinus*, *Charidemus*) are not usually accepted as genuine. But the *Dial. Mer.* are unchallenged, and Lucian's taste for sexual innuendo against his enemies is pertinent. See e.g., *Adv. Ind.* 23; *Peregrinus* 9; *Rhet. Praec.* 24.

11 (= *A.P.* 10.42). Palladas liked this theme (cf. *A.P.* 10.46, 98). If Lucian wrote the lines, he certainly did not practice what he preached. The paraenetic opening has already been discussed, as has the κτεάνων phenomenon. The Ionic form σφρηγίς is found in *De Dea Syria* 20.

12 (= *A.P.* 10.41). The theme is appropriate to Lucian, and to virtually any satirist or moralist (Labarbe 381). The οὗτος flourish has been discussed before; Reitz and Jacobitz register no other Lucianic use of the verb σωρεύειν (line 6).

13 (= *A.P.* 9.74). The tradition tends to regard this poem as anonymous, and it is usually so regarded by scholars.[21] The sentiment is Lucianic enough, but fatally common. The conceit of the philosophical field would not be out of place for Lucian, who elsewhere has a litigious letter of the Greek alphabet, and a tyrant's bed and lamp as witnesses in an infernal courtroom.[22] However, other poets in the Anthology use the technique,[23] and so the point is inconclusive.

The dangers of inferring anything from the name Menippus have already been discussed. Achaemenides is so infrequent a name[24] that it is omitted from Jacobitz' *Index Rerum*.[25] One may think of the hapless Achaemenides left behind on Polyphemus' island by Ulysses,[26] but he has no obvious relevance. The name was perhaps employed for its overtones of Persian royalty; this would provide a superficially effective contrast with the name of Menippus.

14 (= *A.P.* 10.35). The theme of fickle friends is on a par with *Epigram* 10; see my discussion of that poem (also Labarbe 377). Two linguistic details merit attention. The last word of the epigram (συμμεταβαλλόμενα) is registered only for *Demosthenis Encomium* 46 by Jacobitz and Reitz, outside the present passage. Also, in line 4, the manuscripts vary between ῥιπαῖς and ῥοπαῖς. The former was read by Jacobitz, who gives no other example of the noun in Lucian. Reitz preferred the latter, probably because it occurs in *Demosthenis Encomium* 38, in exactly the same context of Fortune, as well as in *Rhetorum Praeceptor* 9.

As always, it is hard to know what to make of such details, and this particular situation is bedevilled by the long dispute over the authorship of the *Demosthenis Encomium*. It is tempting, however, in spite of this,

[21] So Paton; also Pape-Benseler, *s.v.* Achaemenides.
[22] In the *Iudicium Vocalium*, and *Cataplus* 27.
[23] 9.3, 4, 6, 75, 78, 79.
[24] Only registered in this passage by Pape-Benseler.
[25] As, indeed, was the word ἀγρός from his *Index Graecus*!
[26] *Aen.* 3.588 f.; see R. D. Williams' note *ad locum*.

and of the manuscript variants, to believe that whoever wrote this dialogue also penned the present epigram.

15 (= *A.P.* 10.122). Manuscript evidence tends towards Lucillius as the author of this piece on the humble and the exalted (so Paton). The theme is a little outside the run-of-the-mill ethical commonplaces in the Anthology (Labarbe 382). The opening phrase and its thought are strikingly paralleled in *Halcyon* 4, but this piece is usually denied to Lucian (cf. MacLeod 303–305). It is also redolent of the celebrated Euripidean tag which concludes the *Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Bacchae*, *Helen*, and *Medea*; this tag is quoted by Lucian in *Convivium* 48, to round off that dialogue. The epigram may or may not be by Lucian: it is certainly Lucianic.

16 (= *A.P.* 10.37). There is little one can say about this piece. The sentiment could be related to Lucian's philosophical agnosticism, though certainly not to his own frequently hot-headed self. The epithet βραδύπους is uncommon, and seems to occur nowhere else in Lucian.

17 (= *A.P.* 10.43). This piece of semantic play has really come down as an anonymous epigram, and Paton so regards it. It would fit the collection of riddles and similar squibs in Book 14 of the Anthology, most of which Paton ascribes to Metrodorus. The attribution of this epigram to Lucian is without much warrant in the manuscripts; it is not impossible, though, that such an acute student of language as the satirist liked to fool sometimes with this sort of play.

18 (= *A.P.* 11.431). The theme of gluttony recurs in *Epigram* 46 (a greedy Cynic) and *Epigram* 50 (on a glutton). Lucillius has a group of epigrams on the theme (*A.P.* 11.205–208), the last of which has the same jest about slow runners who are quick to the table. The general theme is quite Lucianic (e.g., the *Convivium*).

The lengthening of the imperative "ε" is paralleled in epigrams by Hedylus and Posidippus (see Giangrande, 158, n. 2), but we have already suggested that the occurrence of *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break in four of our 217 "Lucianic" lines is no coincidence (above, *Ep.* 8).

19 (= *A.P.* 11.428). On the impossibility of turning black into white. Lucian has the proverbial scrubbing of the Ethiopian in *Adversus Indoctum* 28, and Zeus regards an Ethiopian tan as one of the marks of fake philosophers in *Bis Accusatus* 6.

The adjective δνοφερός is not registered elsewhere in Lucian by Reitz or Jacobitz; as applied to night, however, it is Homeric, and the phrase

occurs in sepulchral hexameters.[27] The verb καθηλιάζω is equally isolated; indeed, *LSJ* cites only this occurrence.

Both theme and Homeric flourishes are utterly Lucianic,[28] and it is quite likely that Lucian wrote this epigram.

20 (= *A.P.* 11.80). On the statue of the useless boxer Apis. This poem needs to be assessed along with the following:

21 (= *A.P.* 11.81). On the equally ineffectual pugilist Androleos. Both epigrams are usually assigned to Lucillius; they have been exhaustively analysed by Louis Robert (181 f.). The theme was certainly a favourite of Lucillius.[29] Androleos is a very uncommon name; Lucian has the commoner Androgeos.[30]. Apis is a professional name, connoting the Egyptian bull.[31] Lucian liked to poke fun at the latter (*De Sacrificiis* 15; *Charon* 13; *De Astrologia* 7; *De Dea Syria* 6), and a joke about a boxer called Apis might be seen as a logical extension of this motif. Might the serious metrical fault incurred in order to bring Apis into *Ep.* 20 suggest that the name is one used by an actual boxer? As might be expected from the author of the *Anacharsis*, Lucian knew enough about the prevalence of Egyptian athletes to include the boxer Areius from that country in the mock contests in *Vera Historia* 2.22.[32] It is notable that Areius draws his bout, and is not ridiculed. Jokes against boxers are not a normal Lucianic motif, and the evidence points to Lucillius as the author of these epigrams, but Lucian was capable of ridiculing anything out of personal spite, and the theme is not impossible for him.

The name Damoteles in *Epigram* 21 is omitted from Jacobitz' index; it does not assist in the search for the author.

22 (= *A.P.* 11.400). An invocation to Grammar. Sincere or ironic? The Anthology is full of attacks on grammar and grammarians.[33] Lucian's statement that Grammar's cure for hunger is the opening of Homer's *Iliad* is reversed in *A.P.* 9. 169 (Palladas), and *A.P.* 11.140 (Lucillius). The concluding parody of the opening of Aratus' *Phenomena* has a Lucianic flavour, for the satirist likes quoting the original (*Prometheus* 14; *Icaromenippus* 24).

[27] *Od.* 13.269; Kaibel, 1046.26.

[28] See O. Bouquiaux-Simon, *Les Lectures Homériques de Lucien* (Brussels 1965).

[29] *A.P.* 11.75, 76, 79 (to cite but a few); see also H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London 1964) 101.

[30] Androleos. Only here in Pape-Benseler; Androgeos in *De Saltatione* 49.

[31] See Robert, 236–237, for an amusing account.

[32] See Robert for Egyptian boxers; Bompaire sees this epigram as Lucianic, but does not say why.

[33] 9.169, 173, 489; 11.138, 139, 140, 321, 322.

According to his mood of the moment, Lucian was capable of penning a sincere or a mocking tribute to Grammar (one also recalls the Goddess Gout). The Aratus parody is not conclusive as to authorship; in view of Lucian's liking for the original, the epigram could be seen as a poem written by someone with Lucian in mind. The references to Homer's exordium to the *Iliad*, and the hunger motif, are quite standardized within the Anthology's poems on grammar and grammarians.[34]

23 (= *A.P.* 11.427). This attack on a stinking exorcist can be compared to *Philopseudes* 16 (thought by a furious scholiast to be an attack on Christ), where an unnamed Syrian from Palestine is described as casting out devils for large fees; also with *Dial. Mer.* 4.4, where an old Syrian hag supplies love-spells to courtesans to bring back faithless lovers (a nice touch, in context) at modest prices. The dung motif is also in keeping, since the *Alexander* opens with a comparison of the filthy tale of the false prophet to the accumulations in the Augean stables. The epigram is very likely to be genuine.

24 (= *A.P.* 11.239). An attack on Telesilla. Lucillius is usually credited with this lampoon. Personal abuse of women is not typical of Lucian. The poetess Telesilla is mentioned favourably in the disputed *Amores* 30; she is commended in a list of female poets in *A.P.* 9.26 (Antipater of Thessalonica), and had something of an enduring reputation.[35] However, the poetess need not be meant. The name occurs in a sepulchral inscription, and, as the dedicator of a weaving-comb, in a poem by Antipater of Sidon.[36]

25 (= *A.P.* 11.129). This epigram on a mumpsy poet is generally ascribed to Cerealis or Cerealius; it occurs in a group of epigrams on poets (*A.P.* 11.127–137) by Antipater of Sidon, Pollianus, and Lucillius. Attacks on poets are rare in Lucian, largely no doubt because of the relative dearth of them, compared with sophists and archaists, in the second century; however, there is some general mockery of poets and poetry (especially epic) in, e.g., *Jupiter Tragoedus* 6. It is quite possible that Lucian had the chance to belittle some poetaster of the time; alternatively, that he invented the target in order to utilise the παραπίθια joke.

Although the circumstances are different, it is of peripheral relevance that there is a peculiar account of Nero's tragic ambitions at the Isthmian Games in *Nero* 9 (this dialogue, of course, is usually regarded as spurious).

[34]Bompaire connects this epigram with the *Convivium* (he presumably had *Conv.* 40 in mind), but does not elaborate.

[35]Athenaeus 467 f.

[36]Kaibel, 676; *A.P.* 6.160.

There is also the elaborate anecdote concerning the Pythian ambitions of Evangelus of Tarentum retailed in *Adversus Indoctum* 8.

26 (= *A.P.* 11.274). This squib against Lollianus is very likely to be genuine. That is, assuming that the butt is Lollianus of Ephesus, the second-century sophist immortalized by Philostratus.[37] One infers from the biographer's account that Lollianus was an Asianist, and materially successful: both aspects would be enough to provoke Lucian, especially if there was also something personal between them. Bompaire connects the epigram with *Dial. Mort.* 10, presumably because a recently deceased rhetorician is mocked there. It may be more to the point to observe that the length of the epigram is identical to the inscription set up in Athens to celebrate Lollianus' skill.[38] The epigram might be a parody of, or counterblast to, this.

The mock-epic flavour of the opening, though paralleled in sepulchral epigrams,[39] is completely Lucianic. Yet it has to be admitted that the Anthology exhibits epigrams on rhetoricians by Lucillius and other poets (11.141–152); Lucian had no patent on the theme.

27 (= *A.P.* 11.10). Usually ascribed to Lucillius. A certain Aulus (omitted from Jacobitz' index) is invited to a banquet with the promise that it will not be spoiled by poets or men of letters. (Aulus is enjoined to obey the new rules himself.)

This poem is typical of the problems facing us. On the one side, it coheres with the *Convivium* (and when one reads it, the soirées of Aulus Gellius come to mind); the "law" enunciated in *Saturnalia* 13, which precludes literary activities on festive days, also will be recollected. Yet the theme is timeless, and one may just as validly adduce the post-Lucianic *Deipnosophistae*. One would like to equate the Aulus of the epigram with Aulus Gellius, but dare we?[40]

28 (= *A.P.* 7.308). The touching commonplace of untimely death, in this case of the five-year old boy Callimachus. The theme is all too

[37] *VS*, p. 527 (W.C. Wright, in the Loeb *Philostratus*, accepts the epigram as Lucianic, but without discussion). For Lollianus, see O. Schissel, "Lollianus aus Ephesos," *Philologus* 82 (1927) 181–201, and G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969) 18, 26, 57.

[38] Kaibel, 877; see Bowersock (above, note 37) 57, n. 1.

[39] Kaibel, 110.1 = Peek, *GV* 1872 (for εἰπέ), cf. Peek 1356, 1834, and (with εἶπον and φράζε) 1868–1871; 414.9 = Peek *GV* 1090 (Kyllenian Hermes); see Lucian *Dial. Deorum* 22 for Kyllenian Hermes.

[40] F. G. Allinson, *Lucian: Satirist and Artist* (New York 1927) fancied that Lucian and Aulus Gellius both attended the soirées at the Cephisia villa of Herodes Atticus: a piquant thought. However, Aulus features in another Lucillius epigram, and the name is common enough (see Pape-Benseler's list).

prevalent in both literary and sepulchral epigram.[41] The epithet here attached to Hades is not registered elsewhere in Lucian by Reitz or Jacobitz, but is common in the context of fate or death, and the statistic is inconclusive.[42] The sentiment that death spares the victim the woes of life might seem suitable to Lucian, but is closely paralleled in a poem by Philetas of Samos (*A.P.* 7.481). It is treated in a more brutal fashion by Lucian in *De Luctu* 17; of peripheral relevance is the satire on stock lamentations (excluding, however, the present theme) in *Cataplus* 20.

29 (= *A.P.* 16.154). This exercise on a statue of Echo is variously attributed to Lucian or Archias; it occurs in a small group of such poems by a number of hands.[43] It only seems worth noting that Echo as the garrulous girl friend of Pan is also adduced in *Dial. Mar.* 1.4, and *Dial. Deorum* 22.4.

30 (= *A.P.* 16.163). One of an interminable number of poems on the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles. Lucian has several conventional references to the celebrated statue (e.g., *Pro Imaginibus* 23); there is a detailed study of it in the dubious *Amores*; a small jest about the provenance of the marble and the transmogrification of goddess into statue is attempted in *Jupiter Tragoedus* 10. Lucian was keenly interested in the visual arts (partly a legacy from his upbringing as described in the *Somnium*?), and could well have written a conventional exercise on the theme.

31 (= *A.P.* 16.164). This dedication of a statuette of Aphrodite to the Cyprian herself is misplaced in the above collection of poems to the Cnidian statue. Paton compares *A.P.* 6.7, in which the boxer Scaeus dedicates a statuette to Apollo. The Anthology pullulates with such epigrams (cf. Labarbe 369–370).

32 (= *A.P.* 16.238). A mild joke on *Priapea*, comparable to *Epigram* 49 (a bawdier skit on dedications to Pan). The number of formal poems on this theme is almost as large as the god's major attribute. Lucian waxes frivolous on Priapus' sexuality in *Dial. Deorum* 23, and this epigram is quite in keeping. Eutychides (omitted from Jacobitz' index) is a frequent name in the poems of the Anthology, especially in the satirical epigrams of Lucillius,[44] which may or may not be significant in the present context.

33 (= *A.P.* 6.20). This exercise on Lais' loss of beauty is usually credited to Julian, Prefect of Egypt, with whom the theme was something of a

[41]See Labarbe 366–367; R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, Ill. 1962). See *A.P.* 7 in general, and Kaibel, 697a, for an identical opening in the case of a deceased five-year old.

[42]See Kaibel, 647.11 = Peek, *GV* 1571, for *νηλὴς θάνατος*.

[43]16.152, 153, 155, 156.

[44]11.133 (a dead bad poet); 177 (a thief); 208 (a glutton and slow runner).

favourite. The theme is an obvious commonplace, with or without Lais;[45] in *Dial. Mort.* 18, Hermes points out to Menippus the faded beauty of Helen and others in Hades. Lais is omitted from this sad register, but Lucian had another, perhaps worse fate in store for her in Hades in *Vera Historia* 2.18: marriage to Diogenes.

34 (= *A.P.* 6.164). Lucillius dedicates his lock of hair to Glaucus, Nereus, and Melicertes. Paton gives the epigram to Lucian, whereas MacLeod assigns it to Lucillius (presumably influenced by the name of the dedicator). This is hardly a conclusive reason, though a neighbouring epigram (*A.P.* 6.166) which has Dionysius (saved, like Lucillius, from the deep) dedicate the image of his hydrocele in gratitude is by Lucillius.

It is worth noting that the commonplace first line of the present epigram was discussed, in the context of Parthenius and Vergil, by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 13.27); this might just suggest that the cliché had a certain vogue in Lucian's time.

35 (= *A.P.* 11.429). This squib is the first of the epigrams conventionally printed as the *Epigrammata Omissa*. All but one appear in the collection of satirical epigrams in Book 11 of the Anthology. The situation of Acindynus is strikingly reminiscent of that of Lycinus in the *Convivium*, though the sobriety of Socrates in the *Symposium* could also have been in the author's mind.

The name Acindynus is rare, and looks suspiciously appropriate in context. It is borne by an *ab epistulis Latinis* of Augustus, and one is also tempted to think of the Septimii Acindyni of the late third and fourth centuries, though a reference to any of these would obviously rule out Lucian as the author of the epigram.[46]

The phraseology of the first line is close to *Nigrinus* 6, where it is said that to be drunk on the wisdom of Nigrinus is really to be sober. Of marginal relevance is *Hermotimus* 47, where Lycinus quotes the adage of Epicharmus about the need to "keep sober and remember to disbelieve."

Speculation is extravagant, but one is tempted to say that this poem might not be by Lucian, but by someone who had Lucian's writings in mind. Indeed, Acindynus might even be taken as a nice name for the satirist who called himself Parresiades!

36 (= *A.P.* 11.432). This equivalent to our ostrich-in-the-sand motif is omitted from MacLeod's conspectus. I can only say that I need a stronger light than the fool's lamp to see any clue to authorship here.

[45]Labarbe 377; Bompaire compares the debunking of Helen's beauty in *Gallus* 17.

[46]*CIL* 6.8609, M. T. W. Arnheim, *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford 1972) 193–194, cf. *PLRE* 1.11.

37 (= *A.P.* 11.434). A bald fool. Paton's notion that this might allude to a Cynic is surely wrong, since that breed was notorious for long hair. One of the conceits in *Vera Historia* 1.23 is that bald men are considered beautiful on the moon, in logical contrast to the ethos of those who live on comets. There could be an allusion to the adoxographical popularity of baldness.[47]

The adjective μαδαρός (line 1) is not registered elsewhere in Lucian by Reitz or Jacobitz, and only here by *LSJ* in the sense of bald.

38 (= *A.P.* 11.408). Cosmetic deceit is a frequent motif (Labarbe 379), and is used by Lucian against his enemy in *Adversus Indoctum* 23. The concluding punch that rouge and paste cannot make a Helen out of a Hecuba is striking in view of *Gallus* 17, where it is claimed that Helen was really as old as Hecuba at the time of the Trojan War. The repeated failure of mute and liquid to make position is most irregular.

39 (= *A.P.* 11.404). The hydrocele of Diophantus. The hydrocele motif has already been discussed. Lucian was all too capable of extracting humour from physical disability, but had no monopoly on this unpleasant ancient trait. A rhetorician called Diophantus is mentioned in a neutral way in *Dial. Mort.* 10, but the name is frequent in the Anthology in the usual variety of roles.[48]

40 (= *A.P.* 11.405). The hook-nosed Nicon is also the butt of *A.P.* 11.406 (Nicarchus), and the theme is not uncommon.[49]

The epithet γρυπός is omitted in Jacobitz' index, and only registered for this poem by Reitz. In general, the comment on the previous epigram obtains.

41 (= *A.P.* 11.433). The notion that painters cannot capture the full essence of their subjects smacks of Plato. It is a theme found elsewhere in the Anthology (Labarbe 382), but is quite untypical of Lucian's general attitude to the art. Had a painter been attacked by name, this might have been a case of Lucian's spite overcoming his principles, but the epigram has no formal victim.

42 (= *A.P.* 11.435). Butos is an uncommon name; it is just worthwhile to adduce the rhetorician Buteo, mentioned by the elder Seneca, *Controv.* 2.5.15. See the discussion of *Epigram* 26 for the theme in general, and that of *Epigrams* 8 and 18 for *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break.

[47]On these trifles see A. S. Pease, "Things without Honor," *CP* 21 (1926) 27–42.
[48]6.4 (fisherman); 11.114 (doctor), 257 (victim of doctor); 14.126 (in a riddle).
[49]11.198, 199; also 11.203, 204.

43 (= *A.P.* 11.436). The bad accent of Cappadocians is ridiculed also by Philostratus.[50] Cappadocians were proverbial butts, though other nations and cities are the targets of ethnic jokes in the Anthology 11.438–440). Lucian would not be above such sneers, especially if provoked by some individual member of that race.

44 (= *A.P.* 11.397). Artemidorus the miser. The theme would be suitable to Lucian (one recollects the attacks on the rich in the *Saturnalia*), but there are poems on the topic in the Anthology, by Lucillius and others (11.165–173). ψηφίζω gives a second example of word-break after fourth spondee—cf. *Ep.* 3.

45 (= *A.P.* 11.430). This equation of hispidity with wisdom is best related to the following:

46 (= *A.P.* 11.410). A gluttonous Cynic. Such jokes are entirely in the Lucianic manner; the greedy philosopher, for instance, can easily be referred to the *Convivium*.[51] But the theme was not restricted to Lucian, and the subject is no guide to authorship (cf. *A.P.* 11.153–158). For *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break see the discussions on *Epigrams* 8 and 18.

The compound βακτροπροσαίτης (*Ep.* 46, line 1) is a *hapax legomenon.*

47 (= *A.P.* 11.403). One automatically thinks of Lucian in the context of the Goddess Gout, thanks to his delightful skit *Tragodopodagra*.[52] However, there was also the *Ocypus*, which is probably spurious,[53] and the malady was the theme of adoxographical exercises.[54] It is possible that Lucian himself suffered from the disease (*Heracles* 7; *De Mercede* 31, 39), but so did Fronto and many others.[55]

The epigram begins with a *hapax legomenon*, which is a striking introduction to the poem's theme that gout is the enemy only of the rich. This commonplace is found elsewhere in Lucian (*Menippus* 11; *Saturnalia* 28). However, in *Tragodopodagra* 70, the victim is a poor man. The epigram hopefully lists Italian wine and ointments as remedies, but in the playlet the Goddess routs the Syrian doctors (a nice touch, in view of Lucian's origins) and their much-boosted salve. Inconsistencies of detail

[50] *VS*, p. 594; *Vit. Apoll.* 1.7.

[51] Thus Bompaire, with the usual lack of elaboration.

[52] See MacLeod, 319 f., and the edition by J. Zimmermann (Leipzig 1909).

[53] See MacLeod for the theory that it was written by Acacius, the friend of Libanius.

[54] See Pease (above, note 47).

[55] See Aulus Gellius *NA* 2.26.1 (Fronto), 4.13 (for an unlikely cure by listening to soothing music); one recalls that Dryden, in his so-called *Life of Lucian* (1696), concluded that Lucian died of the malady.

in such humour are not conclusive of anything, but they help to show that an epigram on gout is not necessarily by Lucian.

A two-line epigram by Hedylus (*A.P.* 11.414) regards gout as the limb-relaxing consequence of limb-relaxing Wine and Love.

48 (= *A.P.* 11.396). A rejoinder to one who sends out bad wine as a gift. The theme is as stale as the wine.[56]

49 (= *A.P.* 6.17). A bawdy skit on dedicatory exercises in honour of Pan, six of which immediately precede it in the Anthology.[57] The parody is interesting in its details. Three whores, Kleio, Euphro, and Atthis, make suitably lubricious dedications to Venus. The triad conforms to the Pan dedications, which almost invariably come in threes. Euphro appears in a parallel poem by Hedylus or Asclepiades (*A.P.* 6.161), along with Thais and Boidion (cf. Luck 400). Kleio (or Kleo) is mentioned as a glutton and boozer in Athenaeus; in the second connection, she was attacked in an epigram by Phalaecus.[58] Atthis makes a post-partum dedication in a poem by Leonidas of Tarentum (*A.P.* 6.202).

The humour involved, and the attention to detail, tempt one to accept the poem as Lucianic. Unhappily, as always, the self-same details revealed by analysis indicate that both theme and treatment are too conventional to prove anything.

50 (= *A.P.* 11.402). Another poem on gluttony, this time attacking a certain Erasistratus; see the discussion of *Epigram* 18. The name of Erasistratus recurs in another context in *Epigram* 53.

The noun σπατάλη (lines 1, 6) is omitted from the indexes of Reitz and Jacobitz, as is the compound verb in line 2. *LSJ* demonstrates that the noun is quite common in the Anthology, but registers the verb only in the present passage and the Septuagint.

51 (= *A.P.* 11.420). An anonymous poem on the wisdom of silence on the part of an unnamed person with grey hair. This is yet another common theme in the Anthology;[59] the closest parallel to the present poem is the one preceding it by Philo.

52 (= *A.P.* 11.401). On a killer doctor. Bompaire correlated this piece with the *Convivium*, presumably because of the farcical doctor Dionicus

[56]Apart from the Anthology, see Rhianus 3246 (Gow-Page), with Giangrande's discussion, 410.

[57]6.111–116; cf. 6.179–187.

[58]Ath. 345a; 440d; Luck 398–399.

[59]Labarbe 381; *A.P.* 10.46, 98; 11.310.

in that dialogue (*Convivium* 20). In spite of this character, and the rout of the Syrian doctors in the *Tragodopodagra*, jokes against the medical profession are not typical of Lucian.[60] They are, however, common in the Anthology (11.112–126).

53 (= *A.P.* 11.212). A complaint against a hopeless painter by the butcher Erasistratus concerning the portrait of his son Zopyrion. The epigram is assigned to Lucillius by Paton, who supplies an opening line which gives the painter the name of Diodorus.[61] There are two other epigrams on the same theme by Lucillius (*A.P.* 11.214, 215), and one by Leonidas of Alexandria (*A.P.* 11.213); this latter also attacks Diodorus.

The name Erasistratus has been discussed. A servile Zopyrion is alluded to in *De Mercede Conductis* 23. Lucian's concern for painting, and his penchant for personal attacks, make it not impossible that he could have written this poem.

Finally, there is *A.P.* 11.411, on the theme of an overheated bath. As MacLeod notes, Paton attributed this epigram to Lucian in his index, but has it as anonymous in his text. The attribution was probably a simple error. The poem is not usually included in editions of Lucian.

For the record, *A.P.* 9.617 has the reverse joke of a bath that is too cold. The epigram might most charitably be viewed as a welcome comment on the tedious bath poems in Book 9 of the Anthology. But it also recalls the *Hippias*, Lucian's tiresome ecphrasis on the same subject!

The results of the above analyses are meagre, but inescapable. Not one of the epigrams can definitely be assigned to Lucian, and very few (if any) are quite impossible. In the present state of knowledge, this situation will not change. The reader will have to react subjectively; I have set out what seem to me to be the salient details, but have only rarely offered a formal opinion on the authorship of this or that epigram, for the very good reason that I have found no positive way of coming to a decision. Dull, but honest.

It has been seen that the poems frequently exhibit words not used elsewhere by Lucian. This fact decides nothing. He could well have reserved certain words for his poetic vocabulary; or such phenomena may simply be a reflection of a writer's unconscious selection. Equally inconclusive is the demonstration that there are occasional echoes (sometimes close ones) of Lucianic phraseology. This could be Lucian

[60]See J. D. Rollestone, "Lucian and Medicine," *Janus* 20 (1915) 86–108; H. Crosby, "Lucian and the Art of Medicine," *TAPA* 54 (1923) xv–xvi. Still, it would be a pity to overlook the comment in Athenaeus 666a: "Were it not for doctors, there wouldn't be anything stupider than grammarians."

[61]11.112–126.

repeating himself, Lucian imitating someone else, or someone else borrowing from Lucian.

The majority of the themes and techniques suit Lucian; the trouble is, they would always suit any one of a number of poets represented in the Anthology.

Manuscript ascriptions decide nothing. The presence of Lucian's name does not confer authenticity; it could result from an editorial guess or the fraudulent use of a name that "sells," or simply refer to another Lucian. For the satirist was not the only Lucian; it is sufficient to recall the shadowy sophist of this name, to whom the emperor Julian addressed a letter (*Ep.* 64).

Lucian was a versatile writer, and there is no reason to deny that he could have written some epigrams. The second century was not barren of poets: Strato and Mesomedes are the most pertinent examples, and there are a number of verse inscriptions. Lucian might occasionally have entered into epigrammatic exchanges such as those between Hadrian and Florus. If he ever really endured the life so mordantly portrayed in the *De Mercede Conductis*, one might trace the source of some of his inspirations to the table and the atmosphere of poetic competition over the wine. It is impossible to decide whether the poems should be regarded as *juvenilia*, *senilia*, or simply occasional verses dashed off throughout his career.

There is only one certitude. Whatever their provenance, the *Epigrams* conform in themes, techniques, nomenclature, and language to the conventions of the genre. This is not a blanket condemnation of them, for not all conventions are bad ones: it is simply to state a fact. If Lucian wrote them, he conformed to the rules of the epigrammatic game. Those who find this conclusion unpalatable had better deny him their authorship. By the same token, it will be useful, perhaps even pleasing, for those critics who still worship in the temple of Mimesis.[62]

[62] τεκνίον εὔμορφον, Διόδωρε, γράφειν σ' ἐκέλευσα.

I wish to thank two anonymous referees of *Phoenix* for their very helpful criticisms, and also Associate Editor M. B. Wallace for his many valuable references and observations.

LIV

LUCIAN ON POETRY

Reports on the death of poetry in the second century tend to be exaggerated. There is evidence of a considerable amount of activity in all major poetic spheres. Hadrian set the pace with his squibs against Florus, his *Catachannae* (written in imitation of his favourite poet, Antimachus of Colophon), and his iconoclastic views on Homer.[1] His reign exhibited Strato, the poet of pederasty, and the lyricist Mesomedes whose trifles so impressed Antoninus Pius that that emperor cut his salary. Strato's favourite theme was by no means an unusual one, but it was calculated to interest emperors such as Trajan and Hadrian.[2]

The superficial respectability of the Antonine period did not preclude sexual themes in poetry. Lucian alludes to the popularity of erotic ditties at dinner parties, and it would not be risky to assume that the poetic efforts of Verus incorporated this sort of material.[3] The sexual provided Lucian with a good deal of material. Both heterosexual and homosexual activities on the part of the gods were obvious matters for humour, and Lucian's ascription of sexual oddities to his personal enemies was at once conventional and self-satisfying. It is perhaps cause for suspicion that elaborate discussions of sex, such as the *Amores* and the *Charidemus*, are usually rejected as spurious. Lucian's attitude to homosexuality, and specifically pederasty, has been variously interpreted. The scholiasts dubbed him a corruptor of boys; this accusation is balanced by one modern scholar who saw the satirist as a prime opponent of the practice![4]

1. See Dio, 69. 4, for Hadrian's attitude to Homer, and *HA, Hadrian* 16, for the *Catachannae*. These latter productions may strike some as a typical invention of the biographer(s), but Fronto (Haines 1. 102) is critical of 'confusam eloquentiam catachannae ritu.'
2. Trajan's liking for boys is confirmed and excused by Dio; Hadrian's Antinous needs no comment. For Strato (whose epigrams appear in Book 12 of the *Greek Anthology*) and Mesomedes see A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* (1966), 811-12; also W.R. Paton's Loeb edition of the Anthology. Mesomedes exhibits a wider range of themes than Strato.
3. *De Mercede Conductis* 27 (erotic ditties); *HA, Verus* 2. 7, for Verus' poetic ambitions.
4. *Convivium* 39 was taken by the scholiast as proof that Lucian was a pederast; the other extreme is attained by J.J. Chapman, *Lucian, Plato,*

Epic retained its devotees. Hadrian's views must have polarised the critics, if not the practitioners. Philostratus is scornful of 'Homerids' who imitated the *Gigantomachy* of the sophist Scopelian.[5] Herodes Atticus was a patron of Marcellus of Side, who furnished the world with a forty-two book epic of *Iatrica*. Marcus Aurelius was perhaps the recipient of Oppian's *Halieutica*.[6] The Homeric poet Thersagoras, who cuts such a pleasantly ridiculous figure in the *Demosthenis Encomium*, may well be intended as a contemporary type; Lycinus' deflating of Hesiod's claims to prophetic inspiration might also have made some cheeks burn.[7]

Mime dominated the stage, as is abundantly witnessed by the enthusiasms of Verus, the *De Saltatione* of Lucian, and the dismay of Aelius Aristides.[8] The implied correlation between acting and the histrionic talents required for sophistic display is occasionally

and Greek morals (1931). For the usual objections to the *Amores* and *Charidemus* see M.D. Macleod, Loeb *Lucian*, Vol. 8, pp. 47-51, 467. It is worth noting that Photius, *Bibliotheca* (*Cod.* 129), although shocked by the 'shameful indecencies' of the *Asinus*, excused Lucian on the grounds that he was really ridiculing paganism. Photius seems not to have been at all upset by the *Dialogues of the Courtesans* (one of the few Lucianic titles he specifically mentions). These pieces are rather more than confections from New Comedy; they lay stress on the business side of the girls' profession, and exhibit very little of the traditional 'tart with the heart of gold.' *Dialogue* 5 has some leering discussion of Lesbianism, an attested practice of many prostitutes. Some parody may have been intended of the standard male approach doubtless evinced by the lost 'biographies' of famous whores by Suetonius. I cannot, however, go all the way with Wayland Young, *Eros Denied* (1964), 71, who describes the *Dialogues* as 'a collection of comic anecdotes with a left-wing bias showing that whores are part of the oppressed proletariat but can get along all right if they know the ropes.' A glance at the *Index Nominum* in H. Licht's *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece* (1932) will indicate the frequency of sexual passages in Lucian. It is a risky business to deduce the satirist's own sexual tastes from his humour; anyway, I doubt that this matters.

5. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 518.
6. See Lesky, 812-13, for Marcellus and the tangle of Oppians.
7. It is natural to think of Aristides in this context. See *Demosthenis Encomium* 2 and the *Hesiod*; the former ridicules inspiration in general, the latter concentrates on claims to prophetic vision. For my defence of the authenticity of the *Demosthenis Encomium* see *Antichthon* 3 (1969), 54-62.
8. *HA*, *Verus* 8. 10, for Verus' devotion to the mime (a commonplace in hostile imperial biographies, of course); dancing is condemned by Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* 11. 2. Lucian's *De Saltatione* is regarded as an answer to Aristides' attacks on dancing in the Lucian MS.

underlined; Nicetes, for example, had a reputation for his tragic interests.[9] Inscriptional evidence reveals Aelius Themison, who served up a mixture of Attic tragedy and Timotheus as his own work.[10] Artemidorus hints at tragic contests in Rome; they may have been a logical interest for the dream expert.[11] Marcus Aurelius found time to reflect upon the history and nature of drama. His analysis of Comedy awarded the palm to Aristophanes and Old Comedy, an opinion shared by Lucian and Galen.[12] Lucian gave versatile attention to the stage, ranging from his pamphlet on the mime to the *Tragodopodagra* skit.[13]

Poets and poetry continued to attract critical interest in both languages. Aulus Gellius numbered poets amongst his acquaintances; he describes one lively seminar on the rival merits of Greek and Roman poetry; Favorinus was ready to lay down the law on such matters as the respective virtues of Virgil and Pindar.[14] Marcus Aurelius was coached in versification by Fronto, and was prolific in hexameters.[15] An occasional later sophist such as Hippodromus stressed the importance of Homer and Archilochus, and won a certain reputation for his own lyric compositions.[16] Critical approaches inevitably became doctrinal. Phrynichus was predictably

Vaticanus 90, and is associated with the reply to Aristides by Libanius in this manuscript and the Vindobonensis; the Libanian defence occurs in both. See the Teubner *Libanius* of R. Foerster (1908), 406-19, and also J. Mesk, 'Des Aelius Aristides verlorene Rede gegen die Tanzer,' *Wiener Studien* 30 (1908), 59-74. For the Lucian piece see D.S. Robertson, 'The authenticity and date of Lucian's *De Saltatione*,' *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway* (1913), 180-85.

9. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 518; it is notable that the biographer makes only a passing mention of Nicetes' fame in this respect.
10. See Lesky, 809.
11. *Oneirocritica* 4. 33.
12. *Meditations* 11. 6; Marcus saw Old Comedy as one of the inspirations for Diogenes. This should be compared to the reference in *Meditations* 6. 47 to 'Menippus and his kind' (possibly alluding to Lucian). Galen listed monographs on Aristophanes, Eupolis, and Cratinus in his own bibliography.
13. For Lucian's references to the stage see M. Kokolakis, *Lucian and the Tragic Performances in his Time* (1961).
14. The poets are Julius Paulus and Annianus. See *NA* 19. 9 for the seminar and *NA* 17. 10 for Favorinus' criticisms of Virgil (analysed in my article 'Aulus Gellius on Virgil,' forthcoming in *Vergilius*).
15. See Fronto (Haines 1. 14, 124, 138); the master's threat to extract a daily quota of verses is balanced by the tactful pupil's claim to burn the midnight oil over his hexameters.
16. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 620.

narrow in his choice of poetic models, and is just as predictably balanced by the eclecticism of Lucian and the *Antiatticistes*.[17] Another continuing tradition was Homeric scholarship, pursued by such critics as Nicanor and Herodian, and laughed at by Lucian, who enjoyed Homer but not his interpreters.[18] It can again be said that the unorthodox opinions of Hadrian provided a fillip to this Homeric industry.

In many, if not all cases, poetry was an ancillary enthusiasm. Poets as such were not men of influence, and the concept of poet laureate was moribund. Emperors and gods were celebrated in prose panegyrics, histories, and biographies; poetry's place was the schoolroom, the study, and the dinner party. Juvenal would have seen one of his favourite targets diminished in importance, but his fears about oratorical stars such as Isaeus would have been correspondingly sharpened.[19]

Lucian's views on poetry need to be assessed in the above contemporary context. His opinions were eclectic and polemical. He was unenthusiastic about the Alexandrians, resistant to canons, and concerned to show that the models of Phrynichus did not constitute the entire Greek heritage.[20] Bompaire (for once) puts the matter well: 'Son choix . . . est différent de celui des atticistes, et dans l'ensemble plus large.'[21] This judgement contrasts favourably with

17. Photius, *Bibliotheca* (*Cod.* 158) indicates that Phrynichus only cited Attic tragedians and Old Comedy as poetic models; the critic's narrow interests precluded epic and lyric. The Patriarch's scorn of Phrynichus is refreshing. Although something of a cliché, Lucian's advice at *Lexiphanes* 22 to begin one's education with the poets is worth noting. The *Antiatticistes* ranges from Homer (but not Hesiod) through lyric poetry (Archilochus is a signal omission) to Middle and New Comedy.
18. See Lesky, 76, for Nicanor and Herodian. Lucian ridicules traditional Homeric criticism in *Vera Historia* 2. 20; *Hesiod* 5; *Demosthenis Encomium* 9. Gellius, *NA* 3. 11, is further evidence of second century interest.
19. For the political unimportance of poets see G.W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (1969), 116-17. Lucian makes fun of poetic effusions at dinner parties at *Convivium* 18, and the need to applaud the host's prose or poetry is stressed at *De Mercede Conductis* 35.
20. Quintilian, 10. 1. 53 ff., is evidence for canons of poets; it may be noted that Hadrian's beloved Antimachus was often rated second in epic lists, though Quintilian thought little of him.
21. *Lucien Ecrivain* (1958), 146; I have not been able to obtain E. Ziegeler, *De Luciano Poetarum iudice et imitatore* (1872), which Bompaire, 382, n. 3, says has only 'un intérêt historique'.

the absurd conclusion of Rigault: 'Denique inprimis apud poetas quaerit moralem philosophiam.'[22] Two of Lucian's favourite poets were Archilochus and Aristophanes, hardly the places to go in search of moral philosophy!

Homer, Hesiod, Aratus, Apollonius, Antimachus, and Nicander are the epic poets drawn upon by Lucian.[23] The eminence of Homer is no marvel, and Bouquiaux-Simon hardly needed to take four hundred and fourteen pages to arrive at this conclusion.[24] However, it has been demonstrated that imitation and criticism of Homer were lively issues in the second century; personal taste was not Lucian's only reason for stressing the poet as he did.[25]

Hesiod is given the honour of a dialogue with Lycinus (the *Hesiod*); his claims to poetic fame are conceded, but his prophetic pretensions are scouted. The matter of divine inspiration held some contemporary interest for Lucian; his views may have been conditioned by the posturings of Aristides. It was no high compliment to be cited (*De Astrologia* 22) as a source of prescience; the theme recurs in the *Rhetorum Praeceptor*.[26] Cronus is made to ridicule Hesiod in the *Saturnalia* (c. 6), and the poet's victory over Homer in *Vera Historia* (2. 22) is portrayed as undeserved.

The other epic poets are mentioned casually, in citations or jests.[27] In view of Hadrian, the allusion to Antimachus in *Vera historia* (2. 42) may have some extra flavour. Lucian shows no concern for formal discussion of the merits of these poets.

Lucian's references to poets are mostly in the nature of citations (formal or parodied), reminiscences, and casual allusions. His lyric,

22. H. Rigault, *Luciani Samosatensis quae fuerit de re litteraria iudicandi ratio* (1856), 70.
23. Complete lists are furnished by F.W. Householder, *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian* (1941).
24. O. Bouquiaux-Simon, *Les Lectures Homériques de Lucien* (1965); nevertheless, her book is a useful compendium which helps to spare myself and my readers a long footnote at this point.
25. Householder concluded that Lucian has a comparatively high number of allusions to Homer, especially in the case of the *Odyssey*. The references are usually standard anecdotes or friendly parodies. They are widely scattered across his works; the *Demosthenis Encomium* is the nearest approach to a formal critique.
Rhetorum Praeceptor 4. 7. Quintilian, 10. 1. 52, is lukewarm on Hesiod. Marcus Aurelius has the Lucianic commonplace in a letter to Fronto (Haines 1. 94).
Prometheus 14, *Icaromenippus* 24 (for Aratus); *Demonax* 31 (Apollonius); *Dipsades* 9 (Nicander).

elegiac, and iambic sources are immense: Pindar, Theognis, Anacreon, Archilochus, Stesichorus, Callimachus, Hipponax, Ariphron, Bacchylides, Phocylides, Semonides, Dosiadas, Euphorion, Lycophron, Myia, Parthenius, Sappho, Simonides, Timotheus. Of these, Archilochus is praised for his freedom of speech, and Sappho for her sweetness.[28] It has been seen that he was not alone in his liking for Archilochus. Bompaire notes that 'Lucien est isolé dans l'admiration qu'il témoigne à Hipponax et à Simonide d'Amorgos.'[29] His neglect of Alcaeus is equally striking. Dosiadas and Lycophron are held up as the best models to avoid (good advice!); Callimachus, Parthenius, and Euphorion are similarly deprecated for their verbosity.[30]

The treatment of dramatists is strikingly subjective. Little interest is shown in Aeschylus and Sophocles, and even Euripides, whose religious views were surely congenial to the satirist, has no great eminence.[31] Aristophanes is a natural object of admiration, and is coupled with Eupolis as a mocker of conventions; it is perhaps surprising that Lucian is not in the habit of directly quoting his model.[32] The occasional references to Menander can be set beside the condemnation of that poet by Phrynichus.[33]

'Il paraît assez personnel dans son goût des poètes.'[34] This observation by Bompaire is deeper than it appears. All critics have at least some personal tastes, and it is clear why Lucian relished Archilochus and Aristophanes. Catholic taste may seem an unexceptional virtue, but it needed stressing in the second century.

28. *Pseudologistes* 1 (Archilochus); *Amores* 30 (Sappho) – that is, if the latter piece is genuine.
29. *Op. cit.*, 145; not entirely true, for the *Antiatticistes* cites Hipponax three times.
30. *Lexiphanes* 25 (Dosiadas and Lycophron); *De Historia conscribenda* 57 (Callimachus, Euphorion, and Parthenius).
31. *Jupiter Tragoedus* 41 is the only significant passage; one wonders what Lucian thought of Aristophanes' views on the tragedian.
32. *Bis Accusatus* 33; Householder inferred that Lucian came to Aristophanes later in life, and did not read him at school. Lucian's connection of Menippus with the spirit of Old Comedy accords with Marcus Aurelius' similar comparison of Diogenes.
33. Hermes is made to quote Menander with approval in *Jupiter Tragoedus* 53; Rutilianus was told in an oracle that he had formerly been the poet (*Alexander* 34); a Menander prologue is adduced against Lucian's victim in *Pseudologistes* 4; a lengthy extract is quoted in *Amores* 43, and a proverbial comment on donkeys is naturally introduced in *Asinus* 45.
34. *Op. cit.*, 145.

Critics of the ilk of Phrynichus were attempting to reduce the Greek literary heritage to what they thought was the purest form of Atticism. Poets as much as prose writers were being forced into canons; there is a touch of this approach in Gellius on the Latin side.[35] Debates on the subject were not new. Cicero and Quintilian are simple and adequate testimony.[36] It may have been exasperation at this trend as much as personal quirkiness that led Hadrian to proclaim Antimachus over Homer. Lucian, Galen, and the *Antiatticistes* represented a saner approach. It seems paradoxical, perhaps, that a broad concept of classicism had to be restated in, of all centuries, the second, but such was the case. Equally surprising may be the fact that later critics such as Photius demonstrated a broader and healthier attitude than some of their supposedly superior predecessors. In this context, at least, it is possible to discern why Photius enjoyed Lucian. For an intellectual bond between the Patriarch and the 'Anti-Christ' is not the most predictable of phenomena.[37]

From theory to practice. A brief look at Lucian's own poetic efforts may illuminate the foregoing panorama of his criticism. He certainly dabbled in verses in some of his 'Menippean' prose satires.[38] The satirist is otherwise credited with two tragic skits and fifty-three epigrams.

As to the former. Zimmermann and Macleod are almost certainly correct in defending the authenticity of the *Tragodopodagra;* the *Ocypus* is more problematic.[39] The first of these is a very funny skit, comparable perhaps to Housman's *Fragment of a Greek Tragedy.* Whether Lucian himself suffered from the gout is a futile but fascinating question.[40] Aulus Gellius testifies that Fronto had the

35. Vulcacius Sedigitus' canon of Roman comedians is cited in *NA* 15. 24.
36. In general, see G.M.A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (1965); also A.E. Douglas, 'Cicero, Quintilian, and the Canon of Ten Attic Orators,' *Mnemosyne* 9 (1956), 30-40.
37. For the Patriarch as critic see La Rue Van Hook, 'The Literary Criticism in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius,' *Classical Philology* 4 (1909), 178-89; G.L. Kustas, 'The Literary Criticism of Photius,' *Hellenika* 17 (1962), 132-69.
38. Dialogue complains of this practice in *Bis Accusatus* 33; *Jupiter Tragoedus* 1 is a typical example. Lucian normally uses the technique to show off his talent for parody.
39. See the edition of J. Zimmermann (1909); Macleod analyses the matter in the Loeb *Lucian*, Vol. 8, 319-22.
40. Dryden, in his *Life of Lucian* (1696), concluded that Lucian died of the gout. The notion is basically an inference from the two skits in

affliction, and Marcus Aurelius' wife, Faustina, may have died of it.[41] Moralists of all ages have claimed gout as the rich man's disease. It attracted a good deal of attention from Greek doctors. Hippocrates thought eunuchs and women less susceptible, though Galen was not so sure. Such a view would have given comfort to Favorinus at least! Faustina perhaps was the ultimate refutation of Hippocrates' theory, but the notion adds extra point to Lucian's decision to make a goddess rather than a god out of the malady. He was sure of a bitterly appreciative audience for his sketch; our own century rather cries out for a skit on the goddess Ulcer. It may be subjoined that Apollonius of Tyana had rebuked a young adoxographer for composing an encomium on the subject;[42] the theme recurs in the sixteenth century with Wilibald Perkheimer.[43]

The playlet is metrically competent, and can easily be regarded as an example of Lucian's relish for jokes against the gods. I should imagine that gout is one of the better arguments against belief in a beneficent deity.[44] The malign goddess is contemptuous of the common remedies brought against her, although these are no more desperate than some of the actual prescriptions of antiquity. Lucian has, in fact, been praised for the accuracy of his depiction.[45] The defeated doctors may hint at second century medical men such as Aretaeus of Cappadocia, Rufus of Ephesus, Soranus, and Galen who have a good deal to say about gout. It was a nice touch by Lucian (in view of his own origins) to make his doctors Syrian; the piece also includes his sole reference to Jews.[46] In general terms, the satire might be aimed against the Asclepius cult; poor Aristides may not

question. *Heracles* 7 refers to Lucian's old age and disabilities of foot, but gout is not specifically mentioned. Gout is classified as a disease of the wealthy in *Menippus* 11 and *Saturnalia* 28; the malady is apostrophised in *Epigram* 47. Aulus Gellius had the hopeful notion from Theophrastus (*NA* 4. 13) that it could be relieved by soothing flute melodies. But the logical place for Lucian's gout is in a footnote.

41. *NA* 2. 26. 1; Dio, 71. 29 (the cause of death was in dispute).
42. Philostratus, ***Life of Apollonius*** **4. 30.**
43. See A.S. Pease, 'Things Without Honor,' *Classical Philology* 21 (1926), 27-42.
44. A former colleague, who was a victim, expresses vehement support for this view!
45. By W.S.C. Copeman, in his delightful *A Short History of the Gout* (1964), 28. The long list of remedies spurned by the goddess includes weasels, the tooth of which creature is prescribed in *Philopseudes* 7.
46. *Tragodopodagra* 173 scorns those who use Jewish spells.

have been far from Lucian's mind.[47]

The *Ocypus* appears inferior in terms of manuscript authority and metrical competence. The idea that it may be the work of Acacius, the friend of Libanius, is at least plausible.[48] Another possibility is that it was a second century attempt to upstage Lucian's effort; this argument is obviously reversible. The topic was such a common one that chronological precision is impossible. Lucianic authorship is not impossible, in principle; he was certainly capable of re-using a successful theme, and the piece is not devoid of humour.[49] Beyond that, we cannot reasonably go.

All but one of the fifty-three epigrams derive from the *Greek Anthology* rather than from the manuscripts of Lucian.[50] A detailed study of them is not intended in this article.[51] Reaction to their merits is entirely subjective, and we cannot advance beyond possibilities Bompaire states the only reasonable approach: 'On pourrait se fonder sur les talents de poète de Lucien pour lui attribuer les Epigrammes, généralement tenues pour apocryphes. Certaines sont fort proches par l'esprit du reste de l'oeuvre. Mais l'appréciation est subjective et l'on n'a pas le droit, dans l'état présent des recherches, de se prononcer.'[52]

Authenticity will always be a matter for debate. Lucian's versatility and the popularity of the epigram form with Syrian

47. The goddess prefaces her register of useless remedies with the statement that Asclepius is impotent against her (line 145).
48. See Macleod, *loc. cit.*, for a discussion of this theory, which hinges upon Libanius, *Epistles* 1368 and 1380. Bompaire, 646, also rejects the piece on the grounds of poor manuscript evidence and the metrical and linguistic deficiencies.
49. The motif of the boastful young athlete crippled by the disease, in spite of his sneers at elderly victims, is effective enough. The author of the mock hypothesis to the playlet began with a pun on the name Podalirius, which is used by Lucian in *Alexander* 59; he also thought the *Ocypus* 'very witty.'
50. The texts of these are printed in Jacobitz' edition. Macleod, who prints only *Epigram* 1, gives a conspectus of references between Jacobitz and the texts of W.R. Paton's Loeb *Greek Anthology*. Macleod further comments that a few of the poems are 'not un-Lucianic in style and thought,' but does not elaborate. *Epigram* 1 (which is an editorial comment or bookseller's 'blurb' on Lucian and his wit and wisdom) derives from Photius' entry on Lucian (*Bibliotheca, Cod.* 128).
51. I project a detailed study of the *Epigrams* elsewhere.
52. *Op. cit.*, 646; Bompaire makes some attempt to correlate the poems with Lucian's other work, with interesting though inevitably inconclusive results.

writers are not in themselves proof of anything, but allow the supposition that there is nothing inherently improbable in the idea that Lucian wrote poetry. Petronius might be adduced as a comparable practitioner from an earlier age, or Agathias from a later one. And it has been seen that poetry was not entirely alien to the sophists. There is no reason why we should not believe that Lucian was occasionally tempted to go into competition with a Strato or a Mesomedes. He may have entered into epigrammatic exchanges, like Hadrian and Florus. If he ever really endured the life so mordantly portrayed in the *De Mercede Conductis,* we might trace the source of some of his inspirations to the table and the atmosphere of poetic competition over the wine. Such speculations need not further detain us. Time was kind in preserving the *Tragodopodagra;* indifference to the rest could well be the sanest counsel.

The qualities of critic and poet in the same person can be divorced; recall the example of Housman again. Lucian was no great critic, but then literary criticism was (perhaps mercifully) hardly a separate industry in antiquity, at least not on the modern scale. Apart from reflecting his own tastes, Lucian's views on poetry are worth looking at because they underscore two important aspects of the intellectual history of the second century. First, although the age produced no great poet (as far as we can judge from the extant remains) in either language, and although no poet as such ever attained the social and political eminence of sophists and historians, the muse of poetry was still struggling on. The situation was not so one-sided as the biographies of Philostratus suggest. Lucian did not ignore poetry any more than the mentors and friends of Aulus Gellius did, or Fronto, or the lexicographers. It was an age of versatility.

And of healthy controversies. Lucian claimed to stand for a moderating balance between the extremes of Atticism, archaism, and the Asianists; so did Galen. They opposed the dogmatic pedantries of critics such as Phrynichus. On the Roman side, Aulus Gellius wrote about practically everything under the sun, but he too disliked extreme archaism, as did his mentors Fronto and Favorinus. The intellectual life of the second century was neither so sterile nor so venal as it has often been portrayed. Lucian's assessments of Greek poetry, albeit often superficial, are matters of broad personal taste, of broad taste as an ideal in itself, and of polemic against those who would reduce literature into canon and dogma.

LV

LUCIAN AND EUROPA: VARIATIONS ON A THEME

In the words of his best modern editor,[1] the *Dialogues of the Sea Gods* constitute one of Lucian's most attractive works. And none more so than the last one, which plays with the theme of the rape of Europa. The question of Lucian's source has evoked more discussion than agreement: the *Europa* of Moschus or a painting?[2] In tackling this issue, it is instructive to explore how the satirist's treatment compares with others. Not only poems and paintings, but also the (sometimes overlooked) coins that depict the episode. The results of this investigation may comport a measure of reconciliation between the addicts of *Mimesis*[3] and those[4] who see a distinctively contemporary element in Lucian's work.

First, the linguistic parallels between Moschus and Lucian:

M 29:	ἥλικας οἰέτεας	L:	τὰς ἡλικιώτιδας
M 79:	κρύψε θεὸν καὶ τρέψε δέμας καὶ γείνετο ταῦρος	L:	ταύρῳ εἰκάσας ἑαυτὸν
M 86:	ὅσσε δ' ὑπογλαύσσεσκε καὶ ἵμερον ἀστράπτεσκεν	L:	τὸ βλέμμα ἵμερος·
M 97:	μειλίχιον μυκήσατο:	L:	ἐμυκᾶτο ἥδιστον
M 110:	ὠκὺς δ' ἐπὶ πόντον ἵκανεν	L:	δρομαῖος μὲν ὁ Ζεὺς ὥρμησεν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν
M 115:	ἡ δὲ τότ' ἐρχομένοιο γαληνιάασκε θαλασσα,	L:	ἥ τε γὰρ θάλασσα εὐθὺς ἀκύμων ἐγένετο καὶ τὴν γαλήνην ἐπισπασαμένη
M 117:	γηθόσυνος	L:	γεγηθὼς
M 118:	Νηρεΐδες δ' ἀνέδυσαν	L:	αἱ Νηρεΐδες δὲ ἀναδῦσαι
M 120:	ὑπεὶρ ἅλα	L:	ὑπὲρ τὴν θάλασσαν
M 121:	ἁλίης ἡγεῖτο	L:	προῆγε ὁδοποιῶν

It may here be added that Moschus' verb may corroborate προῆγε in Lucian against the variant προῄει.

M 122:	αὐτοκασιγνήτῳ:	L:	τῷ ἀδελφῷ·
M 124:	γάμιον μέλος	L:	τὸν ὑμέναιον
M 162–3:	φαίνετο μὲν δή/Κρήτη, Ζεὺς δὲ πάλιν σφετέρην ἀνελάζετο μορφήν	L:	ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπέβη τῇ νήσῳ ὁ μεν ταῦρος οὐκέτι ἐφαίνετο.

Not all of the above parallels are cogent on their own. Taken cumulatively, however, they do suggest that Moschus was one of Lucian's direct sources.

But not the only one. Lucian's version is different in several respects from that of Moschus. In these cases, parallels are to hand from other treatments, literary and artistic.

Moschus has an opulent description of the meadow and flowers in which Europa and her companions disport themselves before the epiphany of the bull. This forms a major segment of the painting of the story in the temple of Astarte at Sidon, as described by Achilles Tatius (1. 1. 2–13). It is obviously an element

which any artist could elect to emphasise or ignore, according to taste or ability. So also with writers. Such details are infinitely variable, on the small scale or the large. Moschus, for instance, has the girls picking, among other things, crocuses. This may be a conscious variant on the version of Hesiod,[5] in which Zeus attracts Europa by exhaling the scent of crocus.

Lucian does not elaborate the scene in the meadow. Nor Ovid, in any of his three versions.[6] Horace does not develop the theme in detail, but his reference to it (*nuper in pratis studiosa florum et / debitae Nymphis opifex coronae*)[7] implies knowledge of treatments which did. It is Horace, incidentally, who contributes the most distinctive innovation by having Europa's sea crossing take place at night.[8]

In Moschus, the eyes of the bull are grey and full of desire (ἵμερον); Lucian says merely that he was τὸ βλέμμα ἥμερος. Is there an unconscious echo, or even a deliberate pun, between ἥμερος and ἵμερον? Lucian is equally brief on the subject of the bull's horns, restricting himself to the single epithet εὐκαμπής, whereas Moschus consecrated two lines to the subject.

The most notable discrepancy concerns the colour of the animal's skin. Tawny in Moschus, white in Lucian. We know from Hesychius and Eustathius that white was a common colour in paintings of the subject.[9] Also worth adducing is an Apulian amphora from Canosa on which the bull is yellow above and white beneath.[10] However, what is most striking is the fact that Lucian prefers the colour most frequently used by the *Latin* poets: Ovid, Silius Italicus, and an exercise in the *Anthologia Latina*.[11]

This is not, of course, to postulate a Lucianic dependence upon Ovid. There is little formal evidence that he had the ability or the desire to read Roman literature. A common situation with Greeks. Yet the possibility is not to be ruled out. For Gordon Williams[12] has recently shown how Latin constructions and idioms begin to appear in Greek poetry from the Augustan age on.

With this in mind, another detail takes on added interest. The bull's behaviour so enchants Europa ὥστε τολμῆσαι καὶ ἀναβῆναι αὐτόν. Moschus offers no parallel. What Lucian does reproduce exactly is the Ovidian *ausa est . . . tergo considere* (*Met.* 2. 268–9). Coincidence, or more?[13]

As soon as the bull gallops into the sea, Europa is very frightened. Lucian's portrayal is very different from that of Moschus. In the latter's poem, the heroine is strikingly unafraid, save for one nervous moment near the end, quickly assuaged by the bull's reassurances. Ovid emphasises her fears: *pavet* in one version, *metuit* in another. It may have been these rival traditions that provoked Horace to the arresting oxymoron *palluit audax* which he applies to Europa's emotions.[14]

The most variously treated detail concerns what Europa does with her hands. Lucian makes her cling with the left one to the bull's horn; the right one modestly holds down her dress against the wind. It may be noted that Lucian preserves this image of modesty to the very end: as she is led by Zeus to his cave, Europa is blushing and her eyes are downcast.

In Moschus, Europa holds her dress for the sake of style, not modesty: she does not want it to get wet in the sea. Horace, who does not recount the actual journey in detail, is irrelevant. In one of Ovid's versions (*Met.* 2. 874–5), the hands cling to horn and back; in another (*Fast.* 5. 607), the right holds the mane rather than the horn, the left gathers in the dress.

Achilles Tatius provides by far the most overtly erotic of the literary versions. His description of the placement of the hands is a somewhat inept blend of the various sources. One hand grasps the horn, the other the tail; they manage simultaneously to hold the end of Europa's veil (not her dress) aloft so as to catch the wind like a sail!

All the foregoing variants appear in the non-literary representations.[15] Some reverse combinations are achieved according to whether the bull is moving from left to right or right to left in the picture.[16] In one case, the right hand is empty and idle.[17]

Europa is covered fully by a robe in Moschus, Ovid, and Lucian. A classicising treatment. For in paintings, as Cook says, Europa was fully draped to begin with, then semi-draped, and finally in Roman art frankly naked.[18] A mosaic from Aquileia, possibly from the reign of Trajan or Hadrian, exemplifies this final stage. Achilles Tatius gets the best of both worlds: his Europa is wearing diaphanous, clinging garments that reveal and set off her breasts and loins.[19]

The sea becomes calm as soon as the bull enters it. Lucian follows Moschus here. In Horace, Ovid, and Achilles Tatius, the waters are wild and windy. The satirist's version is nicely appropriate to the context of his gossiping protagonists, the South and West winds.[20] With effective humour, Lucian's Zephyr begins to blow at the end of the dialogue, accompanying the heroine's defloration. Freudians no doubt would make much of that: it is certainly piquant to think that Lucian anticipates the time-honoured cinematic device of representing orgasm by waves crashing on to rocks!

Moschus provides bull and heroine with a cortège of dolphins, Nereids, Poseidon, and Tritons. By contrast, there are no accompanying personnel in Ovid or Horace. Achilles Tatius offers dolphins, cupids, and Love. But it is Lucian who creates the most ambitious pageant of all: cupids, Nereids, dolphins, Tritons, Poseidon, and Aphrodite.

The last-named is the most obvious novelty. There is no need to insist on a particular source for this. Lucian was quite capable of grafting a traditional[21] vignette of Aphrodite on to the Europa story by himself. A small linguistic item attests to the carefulness of his writing here. Aphrodite, reclining on her shell and scattering flowers over the bride-to-be, is described by the rarish verb παροχέομαι, clearly intended to recall the πάροχος or bridesmaid.

If a parallel be sought, painting rather than poetry is the place to look. As Cook's assemblage of examples unsurprisingly shows, cortèges are an ubiquitous feature, from the rudimentary depiction of dolphins and fish on the Selinus metope to the combination of marine life and divinities on the Petrograd fish-plates. Eros and Poseidon feature on the Aquileian mosaic; a flying Eros adorns

an amphora from Lucania. Aphrodite herself does appear, though usually in the earliest part of the adventure in the meadow; or else primping herself rather than playing second fiddle to an earthly heroine.[22] Lucian, then, may here have exhibited a degree of originality.

The *Europa* of Moschus concludes abruptly: three lines suffice for the defloration, impregnation, and impending maternity of the heroine. Some scholars, notaby Valckenaer and Wilamowitz, were bothered enough by this to fiddle with the text. Hence it is worth noting that the same quick finale is employed by Horace, Ovid, and Lucian. Clearly, it was the normal thing to end with the transformation of the bull and its immediate consequences for Europa. And logical too; the resulting next generation of characters were in themselves another story.

Cook[23] emphasised the longevity of the Europa story: "a total duration of nearly two thousand years. The theme appealed, not only to artists and craftsmen, but to poets and prose writers also." A good theme, then, for Lucian's satirical talents. It was not one restricted to the recesses of mythology. The Europa story, or elements thereof, recurs frequently in the Roman period. And not simply in the aforementioned erotic murals and mosaics.[24] Cicero[25] singles out a statue of Europa on the bull as one of a half-dozen or so works of art that people would travel to see. Coins of the first and second centuries A.D. frequently carried her image. Notably, issues from Sidon (confirming Lucian's own account of them in *De Dea Syria* 4) and from Thracian Hadrianopolis, a city founded in Lucian's own lifetime.[26]

Europa was in people's pockets as well as before their eyes in books and works of art. She was a more than usually familiar item in the mythological panoply that underpinned what was still the official state religion. Which is not, of course, to say that everyone believed in her or her taurine lover. What is important to remember is that the converse is not true either. Nor do people need to be professionally or regularly pious to resent satirical attacks on their religion. Our own age is commonly described as one of scepticism and disbelief, with the churches empty and so on. Yet this has not prevented a light-hearted cinematic satire on Christianity, *The Life of Brian*, from creating a furore.[27] Lucian ran no risks in making fun of the Europa story; neither was he altogether tilting at windmills.[28]

NOTES

1. M.D. Macleod, Loeb edition of Lucian, vol. 7, 177; as is well known, Macleod is also the *OCT* editor.

2. Macleod, *loc. cit.*, says "Perhaps Moschus . . . he may also be thinking at times of paintings he has seen." The Bipontine edition of Hemsterhuys-Reitz (Amsterdam, 1743), vol. 2, 392, asserts the dependence of Lucian upon Moschus without doing much to demonstrate it. F.G. Allinson, in his *Selections From Lucian* (Boston, 1905), 185, was only stating the obvious when he wrote that "For the story of Europa Lucian had abundant material both in art and literature." H.L. Levy, *Lucian: Seventy Dialogues* (Oklahoma, 1976), 257, eschews all mention of Moschus and literature in his conclusion that "Nowhere else does Lucian give clearer indications of having been influenced by graphic art." J. Bompaire, *Lucien Écrivain* (Paris, 1958), 733, having stated (without example) that "Lucien est dans l'ensemble très proche de ce poète (Moschus)," goes on to say that there were so many pictorial examples of the theme available that Lucian "n'ait pas eu besoin des yeux d'un autre écrivain." It is almost superfluous to add that precisely the same

debate takes place over Moschus' own sources; cf. Legrand's Budé edition, vol. 2, 142–3, W. Bühler's edition (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 13, Wiesbaden, 1960), *passim.*

3. Most notably, Bompaire, *op. cit.*, followed by G. Anderson, *Lucian, Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic* (Leiden, 1976) and, most recently, C. Robinson, *Lucian* (London, 1979).

4. In particular, B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto, 1974).

5. According to the scholiast on Homer, *Il.* 12. 292.

6. *Met.* 2. 843–75; *Met.* 6. 103–7 (describing a picture); *Fast.* 5. 605–19.

7. *Odes* 3. 27. 29–30.

8. Remarked by G. Williams in his edition (Oxford, 1969), 138; cf. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 192–6.

9. Hesychius, *s.v.* ἀργιμήτης; Eustathius, *in Od.* p. 1430, 63.

10. Full descriptions and copious illustrations of this and the other artistic representations of the Europa theme are most conveniently assembled in A.B. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge, 1940), vol. 3, 615–28.

11. Ovid, *Met.* 2. 852, 861, 865 (notice the insistence on the point); Silius 14. 568; *Anth. Lat.* 1. 1. 49.

12. *Change and Decline* (Berkeley, 1978), 132–4; cf. A. Cameron, *Claudian* (Oxford, 1970), 19–20.

13. One obviously cannot rule out the possibility that the detail derives from a lost Greek version. There were plenty of these, in both prose and verse; cf. Cook, *op. cit.*, 628, for a conspectus. The same qualification obtains in the case of Horace's nocturnal setting, remarked on above.

14. On this, cf. Williams' edition, *loc. cit.*

15. E.g., on the metope from the earliest temple at Selinus, the left hand holds the horn, the right one rests on the back. Cf. Cook, *op. cit.*, 615–6; G. Hafner, *The Art of Rome, Etruria, and Magna Graecia* (New York, 1969), 40–1.

16. Right to left movement seems less common. Examples include a Lucanian amphora (Cook, 619) and a mosaic from Praeneste (Cook, 626).

17. On a black figured *oenochoe* (Cook, 617).

18. Cook, 619–27, gives examples of all three stages: the Selinus metope and the aforementioned *oenochoe* show a fully-clothed Europa; Pompeian wall-painting and a terracotta from Hadra display the heroine half-naked, as does a mosaic from Praeneste, whose back view is a pygophile's delight; the Aquileian mosaic is the best nude treatment.

19. Notice that Achilles Tatius treats Europa's maids in much the same way, depicting them with fetching mini-tunics and the like. Cf. R.W. Garson, 'Works of Art in Achilles Tatius', *Acta Classica* 21 (1978), 83–6.

20. The scene is notably in contrast with Horace's description of the furious activity of the South and West winds.

21. *Anacreontea* 57, for easy example.

22. Cook, 622, exemplifies with an Apulian *krater* for the meadow scene, and a similar item from South Italy for the primping.

23. *Op. cit.*, 622–8.

24. Although not strictly the Europa theme, the depiction of a cortège, involving Poseidon and Amphitrite on the so-called altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus (2nd or 1st century B.C.) is worth noting; cf. R. Bianchi Bandielli, *The Centre of Power: Roman Art to A.D. 200* (London, 1970), 53.

25. *In Verr.* 4. 135.

26. For the coins, cf. B.V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (2nd edit., Chicago reprint, 1967), 287, 461, 465–7, 472, 525, 727–8, 797–8. Some cities, notably Gortyn, seem to have developed local versions or iconography of the story, a point worth keeping in mind when assessing the discrepant details in the literary and artistic descriptions; cf. A. Von Sallet, 'Die Umschrift der Europa auf Silbermünzen von Gortyna,' *Zeitschrift f. Num.* 6 (1897), 263.

27. Released in 1979 by the British satirical team known as Monty Python. At the time of writing, the film has provoked bannings and litigations in various parts of North America.

28. Impulse for the present paper came largely from hearing the excellent talk on Moschus' *Europa* given as a departmental seminar at Calgary in November, 1979, by my colleague Dr. R.C. Schmiel; he is not guilty by association with any part of my work.

LVI

LUCIAN AND THEOPHRASTUS

In a recent article [1]), M. D. Macleod suggested that Lucian was probably familiar with the *Characters* of Theophrastus. This attractive notion can be further supported.

The passages adduced by Macleod (and other scholars cited by him) can receive supplement. Consider, first, this Theophrastean sentence (*Ch.* 2, 12): καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν φῆσαι εὖ ἠρχιτεκτονῆσθαι καὶ τὸν ἀγρὸν εὖ πεφυτεῦσθαι καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα ὁμοίαν εἶναι. Two sentences from the *Pro Imaginibus* appear to echo the above. They are: καὶ ἣν οἰκίαν ἐπαινῇ καλὴν καὶ ἄριστα κατασκευασμένην, εἴποι ἄν . . . (*Pro Imag.* 20); and: καὶ ἐν γραφαῖς τὰ ὅμοια πόλλοι κολακεύεσθαί τε καὶ ἐξαπατᾶσθαι ἐθέλουσιν (*Pro Imag.* 6). I am not the first to make the connection. Jebb, in his edition of the *Characters*, thought Lucian was parodying Theophrastus; Ussher's commentary regards Lucian's phrases as modelled on *Ch.* 2, 16. Ussher is preferable, for there is no particular humour at stake in the *Pro Imaginibus*.

Second, perpend the Theophrastean ἀναβεβλημένος ἄνω τοῦ γόνατος (*Ch.* 4, 4) and ἐξιὼν καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον ἀναβεβλημένος (*Ch.* 26, 4) alongside Lucian's ἑώρων γὰρ αὐτοὺς κοσμίως βαδίζοντας, ἀναβεβλημένους . . . (*Hermotimus* 18) and ἱμάτιον ὑπὲρ χιτῶνος ἀναβεβλημένος (*Alexander* 11). The similarity in sound between ἐξιών and ἑώρων, and their identical positions at the beginnings of the phrases in *Ch.* 26, 4 and *Hermotimus* 18 may add up to a convincing parallel. One may subjoin that the context is well-suited to a Theophrastean reminiscence; Theophrastus is adduced in Athenaeus (*Deip.* 175 a) as the model of a well-dressed man, which suggests a second-century *topos* that would be familiar to Lucian.

Third, the inaugural definition of opsimathy by Theophrastus (*Ch.* 27, 1) reads thus: ἡ δὲ ὀψιμαθία φιλοπονία δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡλικίαν. It may have inspired Lucian's very similar thrust at *De Mercede Conductis* 23: ὀψιμαθήτας δὲ καὶ πόρρω που τῆς ἡλικίας παιδευόμενος. Again, a common stock of contemporary exemplars may have been laid under contribution here; one thinks of Aulus Gellius' harsh animadversions upon opsimaths (*NA* XI 7, 3).

From the particular to the general. It is true that Lucian does not formally allude to Theophrastus anywhere in his extant writings. That is, unless one is willing to allow the *Demosthenis Encomium* as genuine. For in that piece, Theophrastus is paraded as a teacher or inspirer of Demosthenes (*Dem. Enc.* 12).

However, a good deal of knowledge of Theophrastus is evinced by writers of the second and third centuries. Fronto [2]) quotes him once, as does his imperial pupil Marcus Aurelius [3]); Aulus Gellius [4]) refers to him several times, with at least two formulaic expressions of admiration [5]); there are allusions to Theophrastus in Galen [6]), Pollux [7]), and Athenaeus [8]); and his diction once has the honour of a condemnation by Phrynichus [9]). On the Latin side again, there are references in Apuleius)[10].

It is likely enough that a good deal of this paraded knowledge of Theophrastus came from abridgements, or at second or third hand. Gellius is explicit enough on this, in a passage where Cicero is the acknowledged medium for Theophrastean concepts of friendship (*NA* I 3, 10). Lucian is unlikely to have risen above the general level in this regard, though Galen at least may have toiled through the originals for himself.

Theophrastus, then, was being read in one form or another in Lucian's day and beyond. He is not an author much represented (as yet) on papyri. The one notable document (*P. Oxy.* 4. 699) contains the end of *Ch.* 25 and the beginning of *Ch.* 26. Grenfell-Hunt stressed that the text is a compendium one rather than a full version. This papyrus belongs to the third century, which is in general accord with the usual dating of the spurious *Preface* attached to the *Characters* [11]). It also enhances the pattern hinted at by the other references to Theophrastus in papyri, which tend to be in book catalogues, compendia, and the like [12]).

By Byzantine times, the *Characters* had become an ethical text. This may not have been the original purpose of Theophrastus. Furley [13]), developing an idea of Immisch's [14]), has argued plausibly that the *Characters* was intended as a rhetorical handbook for students, rather than as a flourish of Aristotelian ethics. If this is right, it would be more surprising if Lucian had not known it than if he had.

On one point, my findings lead me to diverge from Macleod and (before him) Householder. Both scholars concluded that Lucian "was probably unfamiliar" with the philosophical works of Theophrastus. Now, almost all the references to Theophrastus in authors of the second and third century adduced earlier in this paper are in fact to works other than the *Characters*. From this statistic, one may wish to infer that the scientific and philosophical writings of Theophrastus, in abridged form, were on the standard curriculum in the second century.

Be that as it may, all the signs point to the extreme likelihood that both Lucian and his literary contemporaries were familiar with Theophrastus, and that their audiences were so presumed to be.

1) *Lucian' Knowledge of Theophrastus*, Mnem. IV 27 (1974), 75-6.
2) *Ad M. Caes.* 3, 17 (= Haines' Loeb, 1, 109).
3) *Medit.* 2, 10 (concerning offences caused by lust).
4) *NA* IV 13, 2; VI 8, 2; VIII 6, 9; XIII 5, 11; XVI 15.
5) Theophrastus is *suavitate homo insigni linguae pariter atque vitae* (XIII 5, 11), and *philosophorum peritissimus* (XVI 15).
6) 5, 213; 6, 190; 6, 516; 6, 542; 11, 449; 11, 629; 17 (2), 38; 17 (2), 405; 19, 228. All references to the edition of Kühn.
7) *Onomast.* 6, 69; 6, 107; 7, 99; 8, 52; 8, 53; 10, 19; 10, 149; 10, 170. All references to the edition of E. Bethe.
8) See the excellent index to C. B. Gulick's Loeb.
9) *Ecloga* 317 (in H. Erbse's edition). The condemned usage is κεφαλοτομεῖν; cf. *Antiatticistes* 104, 31.
10) *Apol.* 36, 8; 41, 20; 51, 13; *De Interpr.* 11, 8; 13, 10.
11) On this, see P. Steinmetz, *Theophrast, Charaktere*, II (München 1962), 24-32; M. L. West, HSCP 73 (1969), 121.
12) See R. Pack, *Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Ann Arbor 1952), 44, 1631, 1779, 1780.
13) D. J. Furley, *The Purpose of Theophrastus' Characters*, SO 30 (1953), 56-60.
14) O. Immisch, *Über Theophrasts Charaktere*, Phil. 57 (1898), 193-212.

LVII

LUCIAN, *DE HIST. CONSCRIB.* 34: AN UNNOTICED ARISTOTELIAN SOURCE

Having demolished the celebrants of Verus' Parthica, Lucian turns in the second half of his De historia conscribenda to his own prescriptions for historiographical success. He begins thus:

Φημὶ τοίνυν τὸν ἄριστα ἱστορίαν συγγράφοντα δύο μὲν ταῦτα κορυφαιότατα οἴκοθεν ἔχοντα ἥκειν, σύνεσίν τε πολιτικὴν καὶ δύναμιν ἑρμηνευτικήν, τὴν μὲν ἀδίδακτόν τι τῆς φύσεως δῶρον, ἡ δύναμις δὲ πολλῇ τῇ ἀσκήσει καὶ συνεχεῖ τῷ πόνῳ καὶ ζήλῳ τῶν ἀρχαίων προσγεγενημένη ἔστω. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἄτεχνα καὶ οὐδὲν ἐμοῦ συμβούλου δεόμενα (DHC 34).

The second of these two qualities is obvious enough; Lucian is preaching the standard Atticist sermon. But what of σύνεσις πολιτική? The formula baffled even the industrious Avenarius[1], forcing him to confess that „habe ich in der von mir eingesehenen antiken Literatur keine ausgesprochene Parallele gefunden".

In fact, the phrase is Aristotelian; it occurs in Politics 1291a 28. Translations have varied: "political prudence" (Newman); "the ability of statesmen" (Jowett); "a good quality in matters political" (Barker); "political commonsense" (Ross). For the passage of Lucian in cause, Kilburn (in the Loeb) rendered the phrase as

[1] Avenarius, Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung (Meisenheim 1956), 31.

"political understanding," in which Grube, in his excellent discussion of the De historia conscribenda, concurs[2].

The sources for Lucian's pamphlet are a familiar issue. Avenarius reasonably felt that, although Lucian might have profited from Plutarch's lost πῶς κρίνομεν τὴν ἀληθῆ ἱστορίαν, his ideas derived from his teachers in rhetoric rather than from any one source in particular. Wehrli[3], by contrast, looked to the Theophrastean περὶ ἱστορίας as a possible origin of Lucian's main ideas. This is a reasonable notion. Diogenes Laertius (5.47) lists a περὶ ἱστορίας in his bibliography of Theophrastus' writings. A possible difficulty here is the statement by Cicero[4] that he knew of no treatise on historiography. However, the orator does not have to be regarded as omniscient in bibliographical matters. There is good evidence that Lucian was acquainted with at least the Characters of Theophrastus[5]. It is possible that he knew some of the latter's other works. At the very least, he could have acquired some knowledge of Theophrastean ideas on historiography at second-hand, from his teachers and/or reading.

Of course, no intermediary between Aristotle and Lucian has to be postulated. References and allusions elsewhere disclose familiarity with such works as the Nichomachean Ethics[6]. It is not impossible that Lucian got the phrase σύνεσις πολιτική directly from Aristotle.

One is handicapped by the paucity of ancient treatises on historiography. This is, by the same token, a reason to be interested in Lucian's prescriptions. His application of the phrase in question is striking. Aristotle had used it in the Politics to qualify the faculty of τὸ βουλευόμενον, in the course of a critique of Plato's discussion in the Republic of the various elements of a city-state. Lucian transmutes it into a specific quality which the historian absolutely must possess.

The satirist does not expand upon it. Which is logical enough, since he regards it as an unteachable virtue. It is possible that he is tilting against philosophical schools which presumed to a body of teachable principles. In the Lucianic context, Marcus Aurelius and Stoicism may be pertinent[7]. We may also be savouring

---

[2] Grube, The Greek and Roman Critics (London 1965), 336—8. — Similar variants f. i. in German translations, cf. Aristoteles, Politik, übers. v. E. Rolfes (Leipzig 1912, several reprints): „politische Weisheit"; Aristot., Pol., übers. v. O. Gigon (Zürich 1955): „politische Einsicht"; Lukian, übers. v. Chr. M. Wieland (the classical German translation, here cited from: Werke in 3 Bänden, Berlin and Weimar 1974): „Scharfsinn, politische Dinge richtig ins Auge zu fassen und zu beurteilen"; Lukian, wie man Geschichte schreiben soll, übers. u. erl. v. H. Homeyer (München 1965): „Verständnis für politisches Geschehen." — Cf. L. Canfora, Teoria e tecnica della storiografia classica. Luciano, Plutarco, Dionigi, Anonimo su Tucidide (Bari 1974).

[3] Wehrli, Die Geschichtsschreibung im Lichte der antiken Theorie, Festgabe für Ernst Howald (Zürich 1947), 54—71; Theoria und Humanitas (Zürich/München 1972), 132—44.

[4] De Or. 2. 62.

[5] Demonstrated by M. D. Macleod, Lucian's Knowledge of Theophrastus, Mnemosyne, ser. IV, xxvii (1974), 75—6.

[6] De salt. 70; Vit. Auctio 26; Dial. Mort. 13. 5; cf. F. W. Householder, Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian (New York 1941), 41.

[7] Cf. P. A. Brunt, Marcus Aurelius in his Meditations, JRS lxiv (1974), 1—20.

a touch of Lucian's sly humour here; he offers to would-be historians one of the two keys to success, only to point out that they can never have it if not born with it!

It might also be the case that Lucian is arguing the need for political and/or military involvement on the part of historians. This would put him firmly in the tradition of Polybius, who emphasises the importance of αὐτοπάθεια and πολυπραγμοσύνη[8]. One also thinks easily of such Roman historians as Julius Caesar, Tacitus, and (later) Ammianus Marcellinus. In the context of the De historia conscribenda, the names of Arrian and Fronto have an obvious relevance. The ivory tower approach to historiography is happily rare in antiquity. Elsewhere in his treatise, Lucian develops the point at issue. A scribbler who had never left Corinth is ridiculed (DHC 29) for attempting to describe Eastern military matters. More generally, the would-be historian is urged to acquire γνώμην στρατιωτικὴν μετὰ τῆς πολιτικῆς, and is told to disassociate himself from the ranks τῶν κατοικιδίων (DHC 37).

We cannot say how prevalent, if at all, the concept of σύνεσις πολιτική was in ancient theories of historiography. However, there is an interesting recurrence of the phrase in later Greek literature. It is employed by the early Byzantine historian Malchus of Philadelphia, of the ill-fated poet and political adventurer Pamprepius. He describes (fr. 20) Pamprepius as πολιτικῆς συνέσεως ἐμπλέως, which may not be altogether appropriate to a man beheaded by his own leader Illus in 484 for playing a double game[9].

Elsewhere (fr. 10), Malchus applies the formula to the German general Odovacer. The latter is said to combine σύνεσις πολιτική with τὸ μάχιμον. Which collocation is strikingly reminiscent of Lucian's advice to the aspirant historian cited above.

It is possible, though far from certain, that Malchus' use of the phrase betokens a knowledge of the De historia conscribenda. If so, we have one more hint of Lucian's later fortunes as an author. His status as the "Anti-Christ" in the Suda and his scholiasts is a relatively late perversion, owing much to the attitudes of Arethas. In the later Roman and early Byzantine periods, things were rather different. It is hardly surprising that the anti-Christian Eunapius should cite Lucian as a worthwhile precedent. He[10] mentions the Demonax and a "few other works" in which Lucian was "entirely serious". Is the De historia conscribenda to be included amongst these? The satirist is named without condemnation by Lactantius and Isidore of Pelusium[11]. It has been thought that the poet-histo-

---

[8] 12.25.g1-2; 12.25.h4ff. Polybian recipes for historiography are assembled and discussed in the first volume of F. W. Walbank's Commentary (Oxford 1957), 6—16.

[9] Müller, FHG 4, 131; on Pamprepius, see Alan Cameron, Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt, Historia xiv (1965), 499.

[10] VS 454.

[11] Lactantius, Inst. Div. 1. 9; Isodore, Ep. 4. 55 (in Migne, PG lxxviii, 1106); cf. Baldwin, Studies in Lucian (Toronto 1974), 97ff.

rian Agathias was acquainted with the De historia conscribenda, though this is still a matter of debate[12].

To conclude. The phrase σύνεσις πολιτική did not originate with Lucian: his application of it may, however, have been novel; if not, the Theophrastean περὶ ἱστορίας is a likely source, though it might have been in Plutarch's monograph on historiography also. And the return of the phrase in Malchus of Philadelphia might imply, along with the other testimonia given above, that the De historia conscribenda was being read by historians and Christians in the late Roman and early Byzantine world.

[12] The notion is urged by H. Lieberich, Studien zu den Proömien in der griechischen und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung, II, Gymn.-Programm (München 1900); Averil Cameron, Agathias (Oxford 1970), 33, 57ff., 146, is more cautious.

LVIII

FOUR OBSERVATIONS ON THE *PRO LAPSU SALUTANDI* OF LUCIAN

1. Lucian's solecism was to greet a patron at his morning levée with ὑγιαίνειν instead of χαίρειν. The actuality of this piece is suspect in some scholarly quarters (1) with too much being made of the closing flippancy in which Lucian affects to fear that some may feel he has merely invented an occasion to show off his command of linguistic etiquette. That such nuances were a genuine matter both for observance and humour is, however, confirmed by a neglected item in Dio Cassius 69. 18. 3-4, where the advocate Fronto, told upon returning home very late from dinner that the prefect Turbo was already holding hearings, went at once into the courtroom and greeted him with the evening salutation ὑγίαινε instead of the matudinal χαῖρε.

2. Ἐπὶ γοῦν τοῦ πρώτου Σεβαστου καὶ τοιόνδε τι λέγεται γενέσθαι· ὁ μὲν ἔτυχε δίκην τινὰ δικάσας ὀρθῶς καὶ ἀπολύσας ἐγκλήματος τοῦ μεγίστου ἀδίκως συκοφαντούμενον ἄνθρωπον, ὁ δὲ χάριν ὁμολογῶν μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ, Χάριν οἶδά σοι, ἔφη, ὦ αὐτοκράτορ, ὅτι κακῶς καὶ ἀδίκως ἐδίκασας· καὶ τῶν περὶ Σεβαστὸν ἀγανακτησάντων καὶ διασπάσασθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐθελόντων, Παύσασθε χαλεπαίνοντες, ἐκεῖνος ἔφη· οὐ γὰρ τὴν γλῶτταν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν γνώμην ἐξεταζειν ἄξιον (18)

This anecdote is evidently a rare one, not apparently in Dio Cassius or Suetonius or collections of Augustan witticisms, either ancient ones such as that made by Macrobius for his *Saturnalia* or the modern reportory of Malcovati (2). A likely source would seem to be the lost biography of Augustus by Plutarch, albeit the item is not among those specimens of imperial wit brought together in the *Moralia* (206f-208a); nor does it feature in Augustan anecdotes retailed in the Parallel Lives (3).

Conceivably, Lucian had it verbally from a Roman patron or acquaintance rather than from a handbook, which conclusion would support the view that his apologetic examples for the lapse in question could derive from genuine reading of the sources he adduces (4), if not from his own experience (5). Either way, it may justify the notion that Lucian's erudition was at least at times rather less superficial or mechanical than is often supposed (6).

---

(1) Cf. G. Anderson, *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic*, Leiden 1976, pp. 130-3.

(2) *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta*, ed. Henrica Malcovati, Torino 1969, pp. 152-76.

(3) For a conspectus, cf. W. C. Helmbold & E. O'Neill, *Plutarch's Quotations*, London 1959, p. 13. On the Plutarchean treatment of Augustus, cf. C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford 1971, p. 79.

(4) See Anderson, *loc. cit.*, against J. Bompaire, *Lucien Ecrivain*, Paris 1958, p. 343, n. 2; 394.

(5). For Plutarch's use of Roman friends as his sources, cf. C. P. Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50, 59, 75-6, 78, 87.

(6) In addition to the aforementioned books by Anderson and Bompaire, see Anderson, *Lucian's Classics: Some Shortcuts to Culture*, « BICS » 23 (1976), pp. 59-68; *Patterns in Lucian's Quotations*, « BICS » 25 (1978), pp. 97-100.

3. One of the Roman examples claimed by Lucian (13) is the book of ἐντολαί issued by the emperor. That is to say, imperial *mandata* (7). These invariably begin with a formal injunction to the recipient to take care of his health, so the satirist maintains, thereby affording a precious glimpse of the imperial style in such documents (8).

4. Such relatively unusual display of Roman material on Lucian's part, allied to his initial self-description as πρεσβύτης (1), suggests that the pamphlet was written in or after his imperial service in Egypt, the most likely opportunity for his acquisition of such knowledge. This evidence is more precise than that offered by Schwartz, who (9) relies vaguely on « entre autres, la mention de soldats ». The tone of the *Pro Lapsu Salutandi* is that of an old man at leisure for writing and the social round, whereas in the *Apology* (12) the emphasis is on present responsibilities and future prospects. Thus, the piece looks as though it should be placed after the *Apology* rather than parallel with it as in Schwartz' (10) table of literary chronology.

---

(7) This passage is claimed as « decisive » for the equation by H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*, Toronto 1974, pp. 126-7.

(8) The detail is not sufficiently brought out in the bare reference (accompanying exclusively Latin legal texts) to this passage in the discussion of *mandata* by F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, London 1977, pp. 318-9.

(9) J. Schwartz, *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate*, Brussels 1965, p. 14, n. 3.

(10) *Op. cit.*, facing p. 148.

LIX

CREPEREIUS CALPURNIANUS

In their otherwise admirable survey [1] of the *gens* Crepereia, Levick and Jameson allotted no discussion to the character who features in Lucian's gallery of hopeless historians in the *De historia conscribenda*. He is, in fact, worth a look. Scrutiny will both enhance the main conclusions of Levick and Jameson and mitigate their final observation that the *gens* Crepereia "contributed only one figure to the written history of Rome, and his role was insignificant, passive, and brief".

Lucian's victim is a certain Crepereius Calpurnianus of Pompeiopolis, who essayed an account of Verus' *Parthica* in Thucydidean style. He is nowhere else attested [2], and Lucian subjoins no further personal details.

The *cognomen* Calpurnianus is striking, in context. There was a relative abundance of Crepereii in North Africa, and they commonly bear *cognomina* ending in *-ianus*. Levick and Jameson, following Dean [3], observe that such names only start to become popular in the second and third centuries A. D. Thus, Lucian's man is credibly named; there is no need to disbelieve in his existence.

His provenance is also noteworthy. The city of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia was in no way an intellectual centre, nor was it specially fecund in men of letters. However, it does exhibit one notable Roman family in the second century. Cn. Claudius Severus, friend of Galen and twice consul, hailed from there [4]. The fact is pertinent to Crepereius Calpurnianus' claims to existence and interest.

---

[1] 'C. Crepereius Gallus and his *Gens*', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 54, 1964, 98-106.

[2] In *PIR*², he is C 1568.

[3] L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions*, Princeton 1916.

[4] On this man and his family, see G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1969, 83; cf. A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius*, London 1966, 123-124.

Apart from Italy, Crepereii occur in the East as *negotiatores*, and in North Africa as soldiers. Although no law of nature precludes businessmen from historiography, it is more likely that Lucian's man belongs to the latter category. The strongest argument for that claim is that he is berated by Lucian for lapsing into Latin when describing military machines and buildings [5]. His case is quite different from the Atticist historian who transmutes all the Roman proper names into desperate Hellenic equivalents [6]. Crepereius looks like a military man with a Latin background. It is inconceivable that any Greek sophist of the Antonine period would lard his prose with latinisms for any stylistic purpose.

It may be subjoined that Lucian compares and contrasts Crepereius with the next compiler, one Callimorphus. This latter is billed as a medical man serving with the army; his work was not too bad, Lucian opines, apart from a pretentious preface and some disastrous efforts at Ionic dialect; it was the sort of work one would expect from a soldier or camp-follower.

Callimorphus can be believed in [7]. A physician-historian is not implausible. Statilius Crito, a doctor of Trajan, had turned his diagnostic abilities to that ruler's *Getica* [8]. In principle, nothing impedes the belief that Crepereius was a writer of military experience.

His connections will almost certainly have been with the *Legio* III *Augusta*. It contained men of Eastern origin from early in the second century. Detachments from this legion served in the Parthian campaigns of Caracalla; they included a Crepereius [9]. There is an inscription which may well indicate the presence of members of the *Legio* III *Augusta* in Verus' campaigns [10]. Its troops were certainly

---

[5] *De hist. conscr.* 15.

[6] *De hist. conscr.* 21.

[7] This needs to be emphasised, since Stein (*PIR*[2] C 228) was inclined to see his name as a *nomen fictum*, although no doubts are expressed about the other historians named by Lucian. Since Lucian does not use his name for punning or other comic purposes, and in view of the attestation of names such as Callidromus, we may safely accept Callimorphus.

[8] See Jacoby, *FGrHist* 200; Galen (12, 445 K) mentions his work.

[9] *CIL* VIII 2564; cf. Levick-Jameson, *art. cit.* 105-106.

[10] *CIL* VIII 2975 (though *CIL* assigns it to the Severan period).

regarded as transferable in the reign of Marcus Aurelius; we find some of them in the territory of the Marcomanni by A. D. 175 [11].

As Levick and Jameson demonstrate, there were *translationes* both ways involving this legion. A native of Paphlagonia could have found himself both in North Africa (almost certainly at Lambaesis, to judge from the epigraphic attestation of other Crepereii there), and later back in the East in Verus' campaigns. An Hellenic background combined with service under the colours of a legion stationed in North Africa could well have produced a pamphleteer who had recourse to Latin when military technicalities came into play.

In his shameless letter to Fronto [12], Verus states that he can provide copies of the generals' despatches through the agency of Fulvianus, also that he has ordered Avidius Cassius and Martius Verus to produce *commentarii* for the use of historians of his Parthian triumph. He suggests that an imitation of the *Pentecontaetia* may appeal to Fronto as the proper introduction to a Parthian narrative. All of this provides a credible context for our Crepereius.

If the above reckonings be accepted as at least tenable, what do we have? First, it enhances the record of the Crepereii: the *gens* now exhibits a chronicler of sorts. Second, it cautions against easy acceptance of Lucian's accomplished sarcasms. Neither Crepereius not Callimorphus are accused of wild exaggerations of Roman feats, as are others in the satirist's gallery. It may well be, as Lucian has partly to concede in the case of Callimorphus, that some of the *scriptores* produced credible and worthwhile accounts of the Parthian War. Are they to be thought of in connection with the "many erudite accounts" of the reign of Marcus, including his Eastern wars, commended by Herodian [13]? We cannot say. But it seems very possible that the loss of the offending accounts is more of a matter for regret than Lucian would have us believe.

---

[11] *ILS* 2747; cf. Birley, *op. cit.* 251.

[12] *Ad Verum imp.* 11, 3 (= Haines, 2, 194-197).

[13] Herodian 1, 2, 5; the *HA* (*Verus* 1, 1) claims to know many accounts of Marcus and Verus.

LX

THE DATE AND PURPOSE OF THE *PHILOPATRIS*

Of unknown authorship, uncertain date, and debatable purpose, the *Philopatris* is one of the more curious documents to emanate from later antiquity. Its frequently peculiar language and its attempt to fuse traditional elements of the Platonic-cum-Lucianic dialogue with the newer demands of Christian orthodoxy conspire to make it a work of considerable interest to the student of late Greek literature.

No time need be spent defending Lucian against the charge of writing the *Philopatris*. Doubts were evinced at least as long ago as the Florentine *editio princeps* of 1496; they have prevailed ever since.[1] Three considerations rule out the satirist. First, the indifferent Greek, with its faltering syntax and confusion of dialects. Second, much of the piece is a cento of phrases and effects from genuine Lucianic works. Finally, the mention of an ἐξισωτής or *peraequator*, an official not attested before the reign of Constantine.[2]

The last two of these points are equally fatal to the notion, found occasionally in the older commentators,[3] that the dialogue predates Lucian. It has been assigned to around the time of Nero, on the basis of Triepho's claim (12) to have recently (πρώην) had

1. Attached to the text of the *Philopatris* in the first edition of Lucian is the subscription οὗτος ὁ λόγος οὔ μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ, apparently an editorial observation rather than an inheritance from the manuscripts. It recurs in very similar form in the Aldine editions of 1503 and 1522.

2. The earliest mention is by Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4.3 (*PG* 20.1152c), who describes their employment by the emperor as a novel way of pursuing justice in taxation. Other literary allusions furnished by lexica also belong to the fourth century: Basil, *Ep.* 198 (*PG* 32.713b); Greg. Naz., *Carm.* 2.1; 2.2 (*PG* 37.1451a, 1477a), along with the scholia to the latter of Cosmas Melodus (*PG* 38.469a, 473b). *Peraequatores* also feature in the Codes of both Theodosius and Justinian; cf. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford 1964), 3, 120–1. Reinach (cf. n. 10 below) oddly claims that the functions of the *peraequator* are 'postérieures au règne de Justinien'.

3. For whom, cf. Gesner's treatise below.

an encounter with the apostle Paul. But this is to impart to the dialogue a dramatic realism to which it does not pretend. For episodes from Greek history and mythology such as the blasting of Salmoneus (4), the deception of Croesus by the Delphic oracle (5), and Poseidon's rape of Tyro (6) are similarly brought in as events that happened πρῷην.

In 1714, Matthaeus Gesner advanced the thesis that the dialogue pertained to the age of Julian.[4] That, as will be seen, may be more of a possibility than is nowadays acknowledged. Unfortunately, Gesner dwelt too much on a facile equation between Lucian and the sophist of that name who is the recipient of a letter from Julian:[5] homonyms constitute no good argument,[6] and Gesner's dependence upon the point damaged his case accordingly.

The idea that the *Philopatris* is a Byzantine work originated in 1813 with C. B. Hase.[7] It quickly took root, thanks in part to the speedy adherence of Niebuhr,[8] and has held the field ever since. The whole issue then became a debate as to which particular period of Byzantine history did the dialogue belong, with the seventh and tenth centuries emerging as prime contenders.[9] Apparent precision and victory came in 1902 with the detailed study of Salomon Reinach,[10] who narrowed it down to the reign of

4. *De aetate et auctore dialogi Lucianei qui Philopatris inscribitur* (Jena 1714; revised versions Leipzig 1730, and Göttingen 1741), reprinted in the Bipontine edition of Lucian by Hemsterhuis and Reitz, 9, 559–605.

5. *Ep.* 197 (Bidez-Cumont). It is actually a note comprising two short sentences, establishing Lucian as a frequent recipient of the imperial correspondence, but furnishing no clue as to his beliefs or literary activity.

6. It is sufficient to record the presence of fourteen Christian Lucians in Smith-Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (London 1882). Julian's correspondent (presumably not a Christian) would fit the long-held belief that the *Philopatris* was an anti-Christian tract. However, especially since Reinach (n. 10, below), the dialogue has been very differently interpreted, a state of affairs that pays its own tribute to the incompetence of the author.

7. *Notices et extraits des manuscrits* (Paris 1813), 9, 121.

8. In the Preface to his Bonn edition of Leo the Deacon; cf. his *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1943), 2, 73–8.

9. The dialogue was ascribed to the reign of Heraclius by (most notably) A. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1894), 5, 434; W. Crampe, *Philopatris, ein heidnisches Konventikel des VII Jahrhunderts zu Konstantinopel* (Halle 1894). Cf. Krumbacher, *Gesch. Byz. Litt.* 461 for a bibliography of other nineteenth-century work on the dialogue.

10. 'La question du Philopatris', *Revue Archéologique* 93 (1902), 79–110, hereafter referred to by author's name.

Nicephorus Phocas, the spring of either 969 or 965. This dating has acquired almost canonical status,[11] although in point of fact, the arguments for it are few and weak. It is high time this was pointed out.

Reinach essentially rested his case on two items: a linguistic detail and an alleged historical allusion. On one occasion (9), the author of the dialogue employed the noun στρατηγέτης. Taking his wisdom from two predecessors,[12] and relying overmuch on the incomplete lexicon of E. A. Sophocles, Reinach maintained that this word did not enter Byzantine Greek until *ca* 950, adding that 'L'argument tiré du mot peut servir à confirmer la date que nous attribuons au *Philopatris* et pourrait même autoriser une plus basse.' Such confidence was never warranted. One can never be certain exactly when a word came into the language: the usual factor of lost works sees to that, as does (in the case of Byzantine literature) the lack of specialized editions and lexicons. And unfortunately for Reinach's argument, the word στρατηγέτης has come to light in an inscription from Miletus of 196 B.C.[13]

In c. 9 of the dialogue, Triepho tells Critias οἶδα γὰρ μυρίας διαμελεϊστὶ τμηθείσας 'νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, Κρήτην δέ ⟨τε⟩ μιν καλέουσι.' Reinach, developing the notion of Hase and Niebuhr, takes this to be an unequivocal reference to the recapture of Crete from the Saracens by Nicephorus Phocas in 961. Adduced in support is the *Acroasis*, a poem from the pen of Theodosius the Deacon, in which (58f.) Phocas is hailed for his slaughter of Saracen women.[14] A seductive notion, at first sight. Nevertheless, objections crowd in. The author of the *Philopatris* ends his work with eulogy of the emperor and his victories – why is the conquest of Crete not placed in that section instead of being tucked away in a mythological sequence? Also, Triepho follows up his account with

11. Accepted without discussion by M. D. Macleod in vol. 8 of the Loeb Lucian; and in (for instance) the muddled notice of the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (1974), 1085.

12. J. Aninger, 'Abfassungszeit und Zweck des Philopatris', *Hist. Jahrb.* 12 (1891), 489; C. Stach, *De Philopatride* (Cracow 1897).

13. Dittenberger, *Syll.*[3] 588. 60.

14. The poem is printed with the *History* of Leo the Deacon in the Bonn edition of 1828 (cf. *PG* 113). It should be remembered that the accounts of Phocas in Crete by Leo and Theodosius were unknown to Gesner and older scholars. In the present context, it is not too hair-splitting to observe that Theodosius describes the slaughter of Saracen mothers before their children, rather than of maidens.

the remark καὶ εἰ τοῦτο ἐγίνωσκον, surely a very poor way of signalling imperial triumph.[15]

Even if we grant the reference to Phocas, it would not guarantee that the dialogue belonged to his reign – the author might be looking back from a subsequent one. It has already been demonstrated that dramatic realism and chronological coherence are not features of the *Philopatris*.

There are other possibilities. The passage was once connected with barbarian activity around Crete and Rhodes in the reign of Claudius II,[16] which might be congenial to the thesis of Gesner. However, Zosimus (1.46), the source for this episode, asserts that the invaders 'achieved nothing worthy of record'. It might be thought unlikely (albeit with Zosimus one never knows) that he would put the slaughter of Cretan women into such a category. Gutschmid[17] produced a Syrian text as evidence for an attack on Crete in 623 by barbarians or pirates. Reinach rejected this alternative on the grounds that Triepho could not have shown the satisfaction he does at the massacre of Christian maidens: the victims must have been enemies of Byzantium – a reasonable point, except that it is difficult to find this satisfaction in the Greek. Triepho shows no more or less concern for the fate of the Cretan girls than he exhibits for the Gorgon, discussion of whom served to introduce the topic in the first place.

Triepho goes on to mention that the Cretans had shown him the tomb of Zeus, which Reinach took at face value: Triepho will have been on the island in the reign of Phocas as an official, and he could not have had the leisure in the troubles of 623 to be touring the sights of Crete. Most of this is nonsense. The tomb of Zeus was something that did much for the Cretan reputation for mendacity: it is a commonplace in Greek literature from at least the time of Callimachus.[18] Lucian himself often makes mock of the claim, in

15. Notice that Reinach translates both this and the following ἤγαγον as first-person singulars, whereas Macleod treats them as third-person plurals. The latter is probably right; even the author of the *Philopatris* can hardly have postluded the statement 'I have heard' with 'If I knew this'.

16. Cf. the Bipontine edition of Lucian, 9, 513–14, for this. Another theory there advanced, to the effect that Crete really refers to Gaza and Palestine, can be discounted.

17. *Loc. cit.* (n. 9).

18. *Hymn to Zeus*, 8–9.

one case in phraseology almost identical to that of Triepho.[19] This is the most likely inspiration for the author of the *Philopatris*. Furthermore, a Byzantine parallel for this kind of fake, or literary, autopsy is to hand. In the tenth century, Nicetas Magistros composed a Life of Saint Theoctista of Lesbos and, in the course of a description of the great church on the island, he inserted a personal-looking reference to examining a statue of Selene. In point of fact, he has simply thrown in a very close imitation of Achilles Tatius.[20]

This reference to the tomb of Zeus in the *Philopatris* is worth having for another reason: it helps to fill a long hiatus in such allusions between the fourth and eleventh centuries,[21] but it throws no light on the historical allusion in cause. Crete suffered a great deal in the Byzantine period and one hardly requires formal corroboration from history or chronicle to assume the frequency of atrocity. For obvious instances, many must have perished when the Saracens occupied the island in 826, or during the brief reoccupation of the island by the logothete Theoctistus in 843–4. The allusion of Triepho simply cannot be pinned down.

And it may well not refer to anything historical at all. The mention comes in a sequence of exclusively literary and mythological items (4–11). It is preceded by Athene and the Gorgon,[22] and postluded by Hera. Nothing precludes the notion that Triepho is alluding to the sacrifice of maidens in a Cretan ritual: the Minotaur very likely, or something to do with Britomartis.[23] True, on such a reckoning as this, the epithet μυρίας would be an exaggeration, but this is quite in the manner of the author. He had earlier (4) converted Zeus's hurling of Hephaestus from the

19. *Conc. Deor.* 7; cf. *Timon* 6; *Jup. Trag.* 45; *Philops.* 3; *De sacr.* 10.

20. For this, see Mango, 'Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror', *Past & Present* 51 (1975), 7–8. Given this, it may be signal that he later (p. 18) hints at a doubt about Reinach's dating.

21. Sir Arthur Evans, 'Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult', *JHS* 21 (1901), 121, assembled a collection of references to the tomb, observing that there was a gap in the written records between Firmicus Maternus and Michael Psellus. This is wrong, if our dialogue belongs to the intervening period.

22. The Gorgon device would be known to any reader of Homer (and the author of the *Philopatris* incontestably was that), albeit he would not need to go further than Lucian, *De domo* 22, 25; *Dial. Mar.* 12.

23. Cf. R. F. Willetts, *Ancient Crete* (London 1965), 135–6, for Cretan rituals involving the death of females.

threshold of heaven into a jettisoning of 'all the gods'.[24] And with regard to the apparently contemporary nature of the Cretan episode, it will again be remembered that items from Greek mythology are presented in the dialogue as recent events.

Close scrutiny of the language reinforces suspicion that the virgins of Crete are simply one more in a literary sequence. The phrase διαμελεϊστὶ τμηθείσας is Homeric (*Od.* 9.291; 18.339); the *Philopatris* is crammed with epic tags. Another writer laid under obvious contribution by the author of the dialogue is Euripides. Striking, then, to find Triepho introducing his account of the Cretan massacre with the verb καρατομεῖν, for that is very reminiscent of *Alcestis* 1118, where the verb is used of the slaying of Gorgons, a context identical with this section of the *Philopatris*. Almost equally compelling is *Troades* 564–5: καράτομος ἐρημία νεανίδων.[25]

On all counts, the supposed reference to Nicephorus Phocas hardly stands up: its place in the dialogue suggests that it is just one of the agglomeration of mythological examples, and in terms of language, nothing more than a literary cento. With the passage eliminated as a contemporary allusion, Reinach's dating loses its foundations. There is no other clue so seemingly tangible – the general situation envisaged in the dialogue suits any number of periods.

That may be a depressing conclusion. However, it is not a complete surprise. A parallel is offered by the dialogue of Michael Psellus known as the *De operatione daemonum*. We obviously know the century in which it was composed, yet, as Cyril Mango has brilliantly demonstrated,[26] it contains not a single contemporary element and could easily be dated on internal grounds to not later than the sixth century. Mango's concluding description of this dialogue is worth quoting here, since it may well be found applicable to the *Philopatris*: 'On the one hand, it shows a close adherence to an antique literary genre which determines its form and its language. On the other hand, the time and setting that it

24. Compare the claim that Apollo destroyed ἑτέρους μυρίους along with Croesus and the Salaminians (5). Cf. the peculiar reference (13) to the *Birds* of Aristophanes as ποιημάτια.

25. Cf. *Rhesus* 586.

26. *Art. cit.* (n. 20), 12–14.

evokes are neither antique nor medieval, but those of the Early Christian Empire.'

If it can be shown that literary pastiche and allusive imitation of classical texts are the prime ingredients of the *Philopatris*, the search for contemporary allusion and historical precision will be accordingly restrained. The style was what mattered. To this end a brief commentary on the dialogue is here offered – brief, albeit fuller on the author's literary debts than anything published hitherto.[27] It will be borne in mind that what follows below is in addition to the many literary tags and quotations explicitly indicated as such by the author of the dialogue.[28] Various matters pertaining to the content of the piece can also be handily subsumed under this section.

1. βυσσοδομεύεις ἄνω καὶ κάτω περιπολῶν κερδαλεόφρονι ἐοικὼς κατὰ τὸν ποιητήν ὦχρος τέ σευ εἶλε παρειάς. The first part of this is imitated from *De calumn.* 24: ὡς ὁ ποιητής φησί, βυσσοδομεύει τὴν ὀργήν. The Homeric tag is parodied in *Jup. Trag.* 1.

δυσχεραίνεις καθ' ἡμῶν ἢ ἐκκεκώφωσαι. Modelled, as Macleod notes, on *Navigium* 10.

ἔτι ἀναπεμπάζω τοὺς ὕθλους. Perhaps derived from *Gallus* 5: ἔτι ἀναπεμπάζῃ τὸν ὄνειρον; cf. *Necyomant.* 12: τὰς ἀκοὰς ἀποφράττω; cf. *De Calumn.* 8: ὦτα ἀποφράττων. ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς σκοτοδινήσας; closely paralleled by *Philops.* 24: ὡς μὴ σκοτοδινιάσας ἐμπέσοιμι ἐπὶ κεφαλήν.

The petrifaction of Niobe, mentioned here and later in the *Philopatris* (18, 27), may have been suggested to the author by *Somnium* 14; *Pro imag.* 27.

2. ἐμβρόντητοι ποιηταί. Cf. *Timon* 1 for the phrase and the sentiment.

ἀλλὰ λῆρος πάντα γέγονεν ἐπί σοι. For this phrase, or almost identical versions, cf. *VA* 9; *Timon* 1.

27. Macleod, whose Loeb text is here followed, has some valuable notes on the author's sources, but he misses many of the thefts from Lucian and elsewhere. The annotations in the Bipontine edition are vigilant, but incomplete and often inaccurate as to references.

28. In the following commentary, these will simply be signalled, without quotation. References to Lucian are by title only, to avoid constant iteration of his name.

οὐ μικρὸν οὐδὲ εὐκαταφρόνητον πρᾶγμα ἀνακυκλεῖς. Quoted verbatim from *Navigium* 11.

παροπτέος ἢ ἀμελητέος. Taken directly from *Timon* 9.

ταυρηδὸν ὑποβλέπειν. Probably inspired by Aristophanes, *Ranae* 804 (where the simple verb rather than the compound is employed); Aristophanes is an author paraded more than once in the *Philopatris*; or by Plato, *Phaedo* 117b.

καταπεσὼν Τριεφώντειον πέλαγος κατονομάσῃς ὡς καὶ Ἴκαρος. Very similar to *Icarom.* 3: καταπεσὼν Μενίππειόν τι πέλαγος ὥσπερ τὸ Ἰκάριον.

ἃ γὰρ ἀκήκοα . . . μεγάλως ἐξώγκωσέ μου τὴν νηδύν. This conceit recurs near the end of the dialogue (27); see the detailed note there. In both cases the source is *Philops.* 39.

Critias blames his condition on what he had heard from the 'thrice-accursed' σοφιστῶν, a word which requires some comment. It is not all that common in Byzantine Greek. Sophocles registered only its application to Christ by Lucian in the *Peregrinus*. It is omitted from Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Two scholia to Lucian (*Gallus* 18: Rabe 92.3; *Rhet. Praec.* 1: Rabe 175.4) found it necessary to explain the term. A notice in the *Suda* (s 814 Adler) reproduces the scholia to Aristophanes, *Nubes* 331 and 1111. A writer of the period postulated by Reinach might have been expected to say 'Hellene' instead. Its presence here could conceivably suggest an earlier date, though it may just as well be there in its pejorative context to enhance the Lucianic tone.

3. πόσος κορκορυγισμὸς καὶ κλόνος τὴν γαστέρα σου συνετάρασσε. Imitated from Aristophanes, *Nubes* 386–7; ἐταράχθης τὴν γαστέρα καὶ κλόνος ἐξαίφνης αὐτὴν διεκορκορύγησεν.

κνήμην γαστέρα. Cf. *VH* 1.22: ἐν ταῖς γαστροκυνημίαις. The author continues with Zeus's pregnant head and a register of odd births and transmogrifications. Very similar lists can be seen in *De salt.* 57; *Philops.* 3; *Dial. Deor.* 9; cf. pseudo-Lucian, *Halcyon* 3.

In this section, there is also an imitation of Plato, *Phaedrus* 230b, employed for the setting of the dialogue under plane-trees, and a quotation from *Odyssey* 13.228.

4. Triepho expresses the fear that Critias is under a spell, that might turn him into a door or pestle (ὕπερον) a clear reminis-

cence of *Philops.* 35, where enchanted door-bars, pestles, and brooms materialize.[29]

Zeus is said to have been hymned by the poets as Τιτανοκράτωρ and Γιγαντολέτης. As Macleod saw, the author has been reading *Timon* 4, the unique source for these epithets. To this same dialogue, which is one of those most frequently mined by the author of the *Philopatris*, is owed the phrase Σαλμωνέα ἀντιβροντῶντα; cf. *Timon* 1.

κύκνος οὗτος ἐγένετο καὶ σάτυρος δι' ἀσέλγειαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῦρος. A common enough motif, of course: compare, for example, the first line of *AP* 9. 48 (Anon.), Ζεὺς κύκνος ταῦρος σάτυρος χρυσὸς δι' ἔρωτα. The noun ἀσέλγεια, here substituted for the poet's ἔρως, and its cognates are favourites with our author.[30]

Triepho's joke that Zeus was lucky, when manifesting himself as a bull, not to have been set to plough is appropriated from *Conc. Deor.* 7.

The Olympians' dinner with the Ethiopians is obviously inspired by Homer, but in this jesting context probably owes something also to the treatment in *Jup. Trag.* 37; cf. *De Sacr.* 2.

πώγωνα τηλικοῦτον ἔχων. For the phrase, see *Dial Deor.* 5, where Zeus is denounced by Hera for his facial hispidity. Similarly with the divine insobriety: the epithet ὑποβεβρεγμένος here employed is fastened upon Dionysus and Priapus in *Dial. Deor.* 23.

Incidentally, if one believes that the author's phraseologies were intended to reflect contemporary matters, the hirsute Zeus might be taken to allude to Constans II, son of Heraclius, who received the sobriquet Pogonatus.[31] In view of the dating by some scholars of the *Philopatris* to the seventh century, this was worth noticing. So also is the *hapax legomenon* ἐνεργοβατοῦσαν, used of sex changes by Critias in his register of miracles (3), for the concept of ἐνέργεια in regard to the natures of Christ was pressed for a while by the Patriarch Sergius in the reign of Heraclius. Compounds with the suffix -βατέω are a favourite of our author, as will be seen. It is just

29. Observe that both authors have the rarish neuter form ὕπερον. For such magical apparitions, cf. H. H. Davis, 'Some Ancient Brooms and their Symbolism', *Class. Bull.* 34 (1957), 1–3 (ignoring the *Philopatris* item).

30. For the noun and its cognates in Lucian, cf. H. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und Das Neue Testament* (Berlin 1961), 199 n. 3.

31. On whom, cf. E. H. Brooks, 'Who was Constantinus Pogonatus?', *BZ* 17 (1908), 455–62.

possible that he coined a new one in order to make fun of some contemporary notion.

τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀετοῦ . . . αἰσχύνομαι καὶ λέγειν. A combination of *Conc. Deor.* 8: μηδὲ περὶ τοῦ ἀετοῦ εἴπω and *ibid.* 10 (of Egyptian deities): αἰσχύνομαι γάρ . . . The balance of the present sentence in the *Philopatris*, τὸ κυοφορεῖν καθ' ὅλου τοῦ σώματος, is reproduced almost verbatim from *Dial Deor.* 9: ὅλος ἡμῖν κυοφορεῖ καὶ πανταχόθι τοῦ σώματος.

5. Apollo is described as προφήτης ἄριστος καὶ ἰητρός. Compare Aristophanes, *Plutus* 11 (of Apollo): ἰατρὸς ὢν καὶ μάντις ὡς φασιν σοφός. Conceivably the source for our author here; the *Plutus* was the most popular of Aristophanes' plays in Byzantine times.[32]

The subsequent coupling of the Croesus and Salamis oracles occurs in *Jup. Trag.* 20, 28, 45, where they are linked and made a reproach to Apollo.

6. Poseidon is introduced with an Homeric tag, as noted by Macleod. He is then adorned with the epithet σεισίχθων, which is not Homeric; Pindar, *Isth.* 1.76 could be the source. The selection of the rape of Tyro to exemplify the villainy of Poseidon is no doubt owed partly to the mention of her father Salmoneus a little earlier, partly to the Lucianic use of the incident both for reproach and jest: *Dial. Mar.* 13; *VH* 2.3.

The author of the dialogue also exploits sexual episodes for the condemnation of Hermes (7) and Hera (11); and there is prurient speculation about the virtue of the Gorgon (9). At first blush, a typically early Christian puritanism towards the Greek classics, yet the treatment is equally Lucianic in language and theme.[33]

7. Triepho rejects the topic of Hermes with the curt μή μοι (i.e. 'Do not speak of him'). The idiom is Aristophanesque: *Nubes* 83 (of Poseidon), 433 (with Dover's note); *Vesp.* 1179. For Hermes as the pander of Zeus, cf. *Dial. Deor.* 24, where this is his sole and detailed complaint.

8. The Homeric line about sacrificing thighs of bulls and goats (*Il.* 1.40–1) is paraphrased for comic purposes; cf. *De sacr.* 3, where it features in a mock lament.

32. The author of the dialogue might also have consulted Herodotus on the subjects of Croesus and Salamis; if so, that could explain his sudden slide into Ionic dialect.

33. Cf. Betz (n. 30), 199–201, for an exposition of this.

9. Critias (not the militantly Christian Triepho, notice) swears by the Unknown God of Athens. There is no need to add to Norden's classic treatment and the other vast literature on this subject. The celebrated reference by Paul (*Acts* 17.23) is patently relevant, here and in the last section of the dialogue where Triepho comes out with the same oath. Nevertheless, one should not overlook Philostratus, *Vit. Ap.* 6.3.5, where the Athenian taste for erecting altars to unknown gods is commended.

11. Triepho berates Hera for her ἀσελγεστάτης μίξεως, alluding to the famous sequence with Zeus in *Iliad* 14. This was a favourite topic with Christian moralists, who make much of Hera's alleged act of *fellatio* – hence, no doubt, Triepho's superlative adjective.[34]

In this same sentence, Triepho employs a rare (for the *Philopatris*) dual, ἐκ ποδοῖν καὶ χεροῖν, which is derived from Homer (cf. *Il.* 15.18f. for this particular one).

12. Triepho urges Critias to embrace Christianity in a welter of literary pastiche. He begins with a hexameter, thus: ὑψιμέδοντα θεόν, μέγαν ἄμβροτον οὐρανίωνα. That looks Homeric, though it should be noticed that all the epithets are regularly applied to God by Patristic authors.[35] Then comes a reference to the Trinity, with its components painstakingly spelled out. All of this is rammed home by the Euripidean τοῦτον νόμιζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἡγοῦ θεόν. According to taste, this use of Euripides to clinch the merits of Christianity will seem clever, comic, or clumsy. The line in question is a fragment from a lost play; our author will have got it from *Jup. Trag.* 41, where it is used in a mock philosophical seminar. The emphasis on the nature of the Trinity might be thought to reflect a period when it was necessary to combat monophysite or other heresies.

A brief ridicule of Pythagorean numerology follows, along the lines of *VA* 4.

Triepho resumes his 'conversion' of Critias. As before, he kicks off with a scrap of verse, σίγα τὰ νέρθε καὶ τὰ σιγῆς ἄξια. Reinach[36] absurdly referred to this as 'un vers d'Euripide'. Macleod reasonably describes it as an unidentified comic line (it is immediately

34. The cognate noun (for which, cf. n. 30 above) is employed in a spirited denunciation of the act by Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autol.* 3.8 (*PG* 6.1133b).

35. Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* furnishes examples.

36. He apparently (it is the most charitable explanation) misread a note in the Bipontine edition of Lucian, 9, 517.

postluded by a paraphrase of Aristophanes, *Nubes* 145). Given Triepho's hexametric effort just above, and the predilection of the *Philopatris* for opening sections with σίγα or similar injunctions,[37] it is possible that the line is of the author's own devising. Alternatively, there may be some recollection of *Jup. Trag.* 3, where the line θάρσει, τὰ νέρθεν ἀσφαλῶς ἔχει θεοῖς parodies Euripides, *Phoenissae* 117.

Now comes perhaps the only well-known section of the dialogue. Triepho describes his meeting with, and conversion by Γαλιλαῖος ἀναφαλαντίας ἐπίρρινος εἰς τρίτον οὐρανὸν ἀεροβατήσας. Almost every word clamours for comment. First, Γαλιλαῖος. This epithet (not used by Lucian in the *Peregrinus*) inevitably recalls the language of the Emperor Julian. It was a detail that attracted Gesner, and led Reinach to content himself with the simple observation that 'peut-être l'auteur du *Philopatris* avait-il lu Julien'. There is more to say than that. The epithet appears as early as Epictetus,[38] a hostile witness; it is found as late as the twelfth-century Byzantine satire *Timarion*, a manifestly Lucianic concoction.[39] According to Lampe,[40] it is invariably used in a hostile fashion. A curious term, then, for Triepho to employ – unless, that is, the author was intending to ridicule the Christians.

The Galilaean in question is generally regarded as Paul rather than Christ on the basis of the allusion to the third heaven (cf. *Second Corinthians* 12.2), and the description of him as big-nosed, since he is so endowed with this quality in *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 3. One might subjoin that Triepho's account is something of a parody of Paul's own conversion on the road to Damascus.[41] It should nevertheless be noted, since the point has hitherto been neglected, that a passage in John Damascene[42] applies the epithet ἐπίρρινος to Christ.

The aerobatic quality of the Galilaean no doubt owes something

37. Cf. 7, 11, 22, 27.

38. *Discourses* 4.7.6.

39. See the account of H. F. Tozer, 'Byzantine Satire', *JHS* 2 (1881), 233–70.

40. Apart from Julian, he cites *Martyrium Theodoti* i.31 (ed. F. de Cavalieri, *ST* 6 (1901), 80.15), and Manes' application of the term to the orthodox, in *Ep. Add.* (*PG* 86.904a). Julian's practice was commented upon by Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.76 (*PG* 35.601b).

41. Though see Betz (n. 30), 53–7, for the theme of divine epiphany in Lucian and other Greek writers, secular and Christian.

42. *Ep. ad Theoph.* (*PG* 95.349c).

to Socrates in the *Nubes* (225), especially as that play had been referred to just previously in Triepho's speech. However, cf. *Bis Accus.* 33; *Philops.* 12. The conceit is later used of the prophets of doom (24, 25), and is generally worked to death in the dialogue.

For the word ἀναφαλαντίας, cf. *Timon* 47.

Triepho is rescued by the Galilaean ἐκ τῶν ἀσεβῶν χώρων; cf. for the phrase *VH* 2.17; *De Luctu* 8.

13. λέγε . . . διὰ φόβου γὰρ ἔρχομαι. Quoted verbatim (with the slight change of λέγε for λέξον) from Euripides, *Orestes* 757.

An acknowledged extract from the *Birds* of Aristophanes follows, after which Triepho describes the creation of the Universe in a medley of phrases from Old and New Testaments; cf. Macleod for the details.

14. λέγε . . . ἐγὼ δὲ μαθητιῶν . . ., urges Triepho sarcastically, as Critias attempts to expound the theory of Fate. He is, unsurprisingly in view of the author's use of the play in the preceding section, echoing *Nubes* (182–3): καὶ δεῖξον . . . μαθητιῶν γάρ.

The ensuing seminar on Fate consists almost entirely of quotations from Homer.[43] This is perhaps a telling indication that the author is more concerned to show off his intimate knowledge of Homer than to engage in a substantive debate.

A reference at the end of this section to 'the heavenly books of the good' is presumably inspired by *Revelations* 20.16 ('written in the Book of Life').

17. The opening words Εὖ πάντα ἀνακυκλεῖς are perhaps imitated from *Nigrinus* 6: ἀνακυκλῶ πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν τὰ εἰρημένα.

In reply to Critias' question as to whether even the deeds of Scythians are noted in heaven, Triepho asserts Πάντα γε, εἰ τύχῃ γε χρηστός, καὶ ἐν ἔθνεσι. Macleod adduces *Acts* 14.27 for this. Theme and language are in fact a compound of Julian, *In Gal.* 106b, and *Jup. Trag.* 42. Notice also that ἔθνος, here translated by Macleod as 'Gentiles', frequently refers in Patristic prose to pagans.[44]

In the eclectic fashion of the author, quotations follow from

43. Macleod provides the references; it may be added that a couple of these Homeric lines are quoted in *Apol.* 8.

44. See Lampe for examples. What nuances (if any) the author of the dialogue intends is usually impossible to say. The adjective χρηστός, for instance, could be suggestive; cf. Betz (n. 30), 210 n. 1. And it is tempting to see κατηχούμενος in the present section as equivalent to the Christian term catechumen. Until, that is, one observes it in *Jup. Trag.* 39; *Asin.* 48.

Aristophanes (*Nubes* 833–4) and *Psalms* 104.2. After these, he slumps into a misquotation of *Nubes* 86 and an unmetrical parody of *Iliad* 9.313.[45] Recovering himself, our author proceeds to quote *Iliad* 9.191 (also adduced in Lucian or pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 5, 54), and to echo passages from *Acts* and *Romans*.

20. The unsavoury old prophets Charicenus and Chleuocharmus are now brought on parade. To attempt to identify them with historical personages, or even a particular period, is futile. Their main characteristic is the welter of Lucianisms which accompanies them. The opening phrase in the section, Καὶ δὴ πολλοὺς παραγκωνισάμενος ἦκον, is (with the exception of a change of tense in the main verb) taken verbatim from *Jup. Trag.* 16; cf. *Timon* 54; *Pisc.* 34. The ensuing description ὑπέβηττε μύχιον, ἐχρέμπτετο is lifted without alteration from an identical context in *Gallus* 10. Another theft is the colourful τριβώνιον ἔχων πολύσαθρον ἀνυπόδετός τε καὶ ἄσκεπος τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν ἐπικροτῶν, almost every word of which is from a combination of *Cataplus* 20 and *Icarom.* 31. A little later (21) the expression ἐν ἀκαρεῖ τῆς νυκτός is paralleled by Aristophanes, *Plutus* 244: ἐν ἀκαρεῖ χρόνου, which in turn is on display in *Timon* 3, 23; *Asin.* 37. In the following paragraph (22), the sentence οἱ δὲ ἀνεκάγχασαν ἅπαντες ὡς ἀποπνιγέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ γέλωτος καὶ τῆς ἀμαθίας μου κατεγίνωσκον combined *Jup. Trag.* 31 with *Philops.* 8, with hardly a word changed. Finally, the phrase δριμὺ καὶ τιτανῶδες ἐνιδών is imitated directly from *Icarom.* 23; cf. *Catapl.* 3; *Philops.* 30.

Apart from these linguistic items, some matters of content require discussion. Charicenus promises the advent of someone, perhaps a new emperor, who will cancel arrears of taxation, pay off creditors, and take care of rents. With regard to the first of these, both language and theme suit Julian, who boasts of his remissions (*Misopogon* 365b; *Ep.* 73), and who is commended for them by Ammianus (25.4.15). But needless to say, it would suit many other emperors too, in terms of propaganda if not in fact.

The content here is again tinted with literary reminiscence; τὰ χρέα τοῖς δανεισταῖς ἀποδώσει καὶ τά τε ἐνοίκια . . . is quite similar in phraseology and context to *Saturnalia* 15.

45. Though in the latter case, it should be pointed out that there is a close paraphrase of this line in prose in *Apol.* 6. Conceivably the author of the *Philopatris* was doing the same thing.

The promised saviour will also τοὺς εἰραμάγγας δέξεται μὴ ἐξετάζων τῆς τέχνης. At least, that is what the manuscripts have. Macleod, calling it *faute de mieux*, prints Gesner's εἰρηνάρχας. Various possibilities offer. The manuscript reading is a *hapax legomenon*, which need not disqualify it: there are a number of otherwise unattested words in the *Philopatris*.[46] Rohde[47] in fact retained it in the belief that it meant gold Persian coins debased by Phocas. A fiscal flavour is plausible enough, given the tone of the rest of the sentence, but the allusion to Phocas depends, of course, on the dating of the dialogue earlier criticized. Possibly the reading is a corruption of a technical term: many such in Byzantine Greek are transliterated or adapted Latinisms. *Aer-* something would suit a monetary context. So would that notorious Byzantine system of taxation, the ἀλληλέγγυον. Could the manuscript reading be a corruption of something to do with this? If so, the passage would relate most easily to Basil II, who compelled the wealthy to pay this for the poor. And it would provide a *terminus post quem non* of sorts for the dialogue, since abolition of the *allelengyon* is credited to Constantine VIII and Romanus III Argyrus.[48]

Alternatively, the disputed word may have nothing to do with money. A reference to diviners or seers could be got out of the Greek, by means of a compound of ἀερ- and the verb μαγγανεύω, for instance. We have seen how addicted to aerobatic wise men the author is, and the verb is common in Lucian; an old reference to *aeromantis* by Varro (*ap.* Serv., *Aen.* 3.359) may be subjoined. The general context is not inappropriate to such an allusion. On balance, however, a financial meaning probably remains the more likely.

Chleuocharmus advertizes the prophecies of a shaven-headed sage from the mountains who showed him the putative saviour's name in hieroglyphic writing in the theatre. A little later, Crato the *peraequator* asseverates that the prophecies will come to pass in the month of Mesori. Do these two Egyptian details indicate an Alexandrian setting for the dialogue? Probably not. They could simply be there to give a requisite touch of exoticism to the

46. I have noticed the following: παλαιστέω, παρεισοδεύω, πολύωτος, ἐνεργοβατέω, and the editorial restorations διενειλέω and ἐξερρινέω.

47. *BZ* 13 (1896), 6.

48. For the sources and a discussion, cf. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (2nd English ed., 1968), 307, 322.

utterances, and hieroglyphic writing can be linked with the use of works of art and hippodrome inscriptions, amongst which was the obelisk of Theodosius I, by seers.[49] Certainly, an Alexandrian setting is hardly consonant with the earlier maritime description (3), which by its content clearly suits Constantinople.

The cropped sage demands caution. Tonsures inevitably evoke monks and Byzantium: one can see that process at work in a scholiast on Lucian, *Bis Accus.* 20, where a shaven Stoic occasions the comment 'Just like the monks nowadays' (Rabe 139.28). Priests of Isis were also shorn.[50] The detail is of no help in determining the date of the dialogue – it may be nothing more than a conventional detail, taken over from the tonsured seer in *Philops.* 34. A comparable case in this same section is ἀνυπόδετος.[51] Notice also Critias' words concerning dreams and debts. Macleod sees a possible parody of the Lord's Prayer, but we need look no further than the opening of Lucian's *Gallus* and/or Theocritus (?) 21.67: μὴ σὺ θάνῃς λιμῷ καὶ τοῖς χρυσοῖσιν ὀνείροις.

In the next sequence, Critias is conducted through gates of iron and over bronze thresholds, up many stairs into a golden-roofed palace likened by the author to that of Menelaus described by Homer. There he meets a crowd of doomsayers, with whom he debates and remonstrates.

This section (23–6) has been adduced for historical allusions. In his introduction to the *Philopatris*, Macleod suggests that the prophets of doom may be monks. Later on, he proposes that they could be prisoners of Phocas, here criticized for being unpatriotic. This is on the basis of the iron gates and bronze thresholds, since there is an obvious echo of Homer's description of the prison for rebellious gods in the abyss of Tartarus (*Il.* 8.15); there is a similar effect in pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 32.

Likewise, the golden-roofed palace has been taken to allude to the palace of the Patriarch at Constantinople, a centre for treacherous and intriguing monks.[52] In reality, we have merely a conflation of literary effects, typical of the *Philopatris*. The author is not concerned with Byzantine prisons (would any of these, it may

49. For this point, cf. Crampe (n. 9), 20, and Reinach, 95 n. 2, citing Codinus, *De signis* 52.

50. Cf. R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World* (London 1971), 167.

51. On this quality, cf. Dover's edition of *Nubes*, xxxix.

52. Reinach, 96–7.

be asked, have golden roofs?) or patriarchal palaces, but with showing off his Homeric expertise. The juxtaposition of prison and palace betokens ineptitude rather than symbolism – if, indeed, he intended any recollection of the tartarean abyss: the same detail is exploited in the context of luxury by pseudo-Lucian, *Cynic* 9.

Literary effects abound in this whole section. Comparing his admiration of the building to that of Telemachus in the *Odyssey*, Critias calls the latter 'that young islander'. So does Lucian, twice: *De domo* 3; *Scythian* 9. The doomsayers question Critias in Homeric lines about his origin. They have downcast heads and pale faces. The former is a standard detail in this type of satire; it can be seen in Ar., *Nub.* 186 and in Persius (3.80), from whom it is adapted by Jerome of monks.[53] The pallor is also found in the Aristophanic caricature (*Nub.* 103), a line which Theocritus re-applied to a Pythagorean (14.5). Having waxed Homeric (and the tag τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν probably is owed to its use in *Icarom.* 24), the prophets of doom now come out with the menacing statement δυστοκεῖ γὰρ ἡ πόλις, which happens to be a direct quote from Aristophanes, *Ran.* 1423. A little later (25), there is another borrowing from this play: ὥσπερ πρῖνος ἐμπρησθείς (859). Other phrases appropriated from Lucian are ῥαγδαίους ὑετούς (*Timon* 3), ταραχαὶ τὴν πόλιν (*Nigrinus* 29), and διάτορον ἀνεβόησα (*Gallus* 1). Critias' string of questions about meteorological disasters owes a palpable debt to *Icarom.* 25–6. His likening of their prophecies to old women's follies is reminiscent of *Alexander* 15. Here, and with the ensuing promise by the doomsayers to spend ten days ἄσιτοι καὶ ἐπαγρυπνοῦντες, there is a composite effect of Lucian and Gregory Nazianzenus. For Zeus is ἄγρυπνος καὶ ἄσιτος (*Bis Accus.* 2), and the phraseologies of the *Philopatris* are strikingly similar in part to Gregory, *Or.* 5 (*In Julianum* 2), 163 (*PG* 35.693b): οἱ τοῖς γραϊδίοις συγκαθεζόμενοι καὶ συμψάλλοντες, οἱ ταῖς μακραῖς νηστείαις ἐκτετηγμένοι, καὶ ἡμίθνητες, οἱ μάτην ἀγρυπνοῦντες, καὶ ταῖς πανυχίοις στάσεσι παραληροῦντες. And finally, when the soothsayers grin, the description of this act (οἱ δὲ σεσηρὸς ὑπομειδιῶντες) is almost identical to *Amores* 13.

27. Triepho breaks in at last to silence his companion. Situation and language are reminiscent of the comparable moment of

53. Cf. D. S. Wiesen, *St Jerome as a Satirist* (Ithaca 1964), 88, 98, for Jerome's frequent use of the motif.

interruption at *Lexiphanes* 16. The narrative of Critias has made Triepho feel swollen and pregnant. It was earlier noted that Critias was in the same condition at the beginning of the dialogue: there, a recollection of *Philops.* 39 was noted. The *Philopatris* now expands motifs and allusions. Triepho goes on: ἐδήχθην γὰρ τοῖς παρὰ σοῦ λόγοις ὡς ὑπὸ κυνὸς λυττῶντος. καὶ εἰ μὴ φάρμακον ληθεδανὸν ἐμπιὼν ἠρεμήσω, αὕτη ἡ μνήμη οἰκουροῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ μέγα κακὸν ἐργάσεται. Of this, the first sentence is closely imitated from *Nigrinus* 38; the second contains two turns of phrase (φάρμακον ληθεδανόν and μνήμη οἰκουροῦσα) taken from *Philops.* 40.

There is more than linguistic debt here. This is the antepenultimate section of the *Philopatris.* It has purloined these phrases from the conclusions of the *Nigrinus* and *Philopseudes.* Those Lucianic pieces recommend philosophical wisdom as the only cure; the *Philopatris* offers the Christian equivalents, the Lord's Prayer and (perhaps – see below) a doxology. None of this structural similarity is likely to be a coincidence.

Along with the Lord's Prayer, Triepho recommends τὴν πολυώνυμον ᾠδήν – presumably a doxology, as Macleod suggests. The phrase, however, is derived from *Philops.* 17 (employed of an Arab spell).[54]

Enter Cleolaus in a flurry of tags from Homer and tragedy, all noted by Macleod. A late, brief entry into a dialogue by a third character is a common enough motif: Sopolis in the *Lexiphanes* may stand as an easy example. The function of Cleolaus is to terminate the duologue, and bring news of imperial victories. For the latter purpose, he is given a short cento of tragical lines and half-lines, slightly reminiscent of Aeschylus, *Septem* 794, in their opening. The Persians and Susa have fallen, it is claimed, and Arabia is next. Triepho develops the theme in the last speech of the dialogue, hoping for the crushing of Babylon, Egypt, and the Scythians. These geographical details have been exploited for the dating of the *Philopatris*: all but Egypt are said to be consonant with the achievements of Nicephorus Phocas.

Not for the first time, such assertions overlook the literary element. Reinach[55] states dogmatically that Babylon stands for

54. Cf. *Dial. Mer.* 4.5, and Betz (n. 30), 154 n. 4, for other parallels from Lucian and elsewhere.

55. Reinach, 88, followed, albeit with decent caution, by Macleod.

Bagdad, the Scythians for Russians or Bulgarians. As for Egypt, it is presumed that Phocas was planning to invade it. None of this survives analysis. True, Babylon is used of Bagdad by (for example) Cedrenus, but Anna Comnena applies it to Cairo;[56] in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Bagdad is τὸ βαγδάδ. More to the point, Babylon is used of Persia quite regularly by early Byzantine authors. In *AP* 16.63 (on a statue of Justinian in the hippodrome), the poet celebrates ὀλλυμένην Βαβυλῶνα, a phrase identical with that used by Triepho in the *Philopatris*. The conceit is not restricted to Greek writers; Corippus' laudations of Justinian and Justin II exhibit it.[57] Poetic uses of Babylon are also discernible in Claudian.[58] Relevant also is Lucian, *De merc. cond.* 13, where the expression Βαβυλῶνα εἵληφας is proverbial for gaining the pinnacle of ambition.

The same principle obtains in the case of Scythians, a term notoriously used of Huns and other barbarians in earlier writers. Poets and historians are equally guilty.[59] *AP* 16.62, a companion to the piece mentioned above, applied the term to the conquests of Justinian; so does Agathias, in his Preface to the *Cycle*. As for Egypt and Arabia, they are nothing but standard *exempla* for the bounds of empire.[60] The mention of them in the *Philopatris* is of no use for dating.

Critias prays for αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος, and Triepho gives thanks for the blessings τοιούτου κράτους; both references to the unnamed emperor might be thought somewhat cool, even unenthusiastic. The term αὐτοκράτωρ may be a little inconvenient for the Nicephorus Phocas date since, as a single title for the emperor, it began to go out after the famous novel of 629 in which Heraclius introduced that of Basileus. Soon afterwards, from that time, in official language, Autokrator is commonly employed as a supplementary title to Basileus.[61] By the time of Codinus, the three regular forms of addressing the emperor are Basileus, Despotes,

56. *Alexiad* 11.7; 12.1; cf. G. Buckler, *Anna Comnena* (Oxford 1929), 418 n. 2.

57. *Laud. Just.* 3.279 (with Stache's note).

58. References and discussion in Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford 1970), 347.

59. Cf. Averil Cameron, *Agathias* (Oxford 1970), 82.

60. See Alan Cameron (n. 58), 345.

61. See L. Bréhier, 'L'origine des titres impériaux à Byzance', *BZ* 15 (1906), 161–78, and Ostrogorsky (n. 48), 106–7 (summarizing his 'Autocrator i Samodrzac', *Glas Srpske Akad.* 164 (1935), 95–187 – inaccessible to me).

and Kyrios.[62] The point is inconclusive, since Autokrator might have been chosen to honour (or discreetly criticize?) a warlike emperor, but it should be noticed.

The *Philopatris* ends with the proverbial 'Hippocleides doesn't care': an overtly Lucianic flourish, especially as the satirist had used the phrase to conclude a dialogue.[63]

The foregoing commentary has made one thing plain: the *Philopatris* is a cento of phrases and tags from Lucian and elsewhere. This basic ingredient offsets all attempts to find an internal clue to the date of the piece; at the risk of tedium, the point must be exemplified one last time. Three passages in the dialogue have some thematic similarities with sections of the *Chronographia* of Michael Psellus: criticism of astrologers (*Chron.* 5.19–20); refutation of the theories of Fate found in the works of the Hellenes (*Chron.* 7.41); ridicule of the pretentions of the Naziraeans, including the aerobatic motif (*Chron.* 6.19–9). It might be argued on this basis that the *Philopatris* is reflecting Byzantine themes. However, it has been seen that in all three cases our author's main concern was literary pastiche.

A last word on language and style. The dialogue is written in unclassical Greek, at least when the author is not imitating the classics, but that in itself does not constitute a decisive argument for a date of the kind advanced by Reinach and company. One doubts that any age had a monopoly on graceless language, and a glance at an early Byzantine chronicle (that of Malalas, for obvious example) will reveal what was possible by the sixth century. Also, scrutiny of the piece discloses the absence of the commonest aspects of Byzantine Greek.[64] No argument here, then, for any particular period.

If it could be shown that the *Philopatris* had a definite purpose, it might be possible to assign it plausibly to some particular period, even reign. But as we have seen, there is no agreement over this.

62. *De offic.* 17 (*PG* 157.161b).

63. Namely the *Apology*; cf. also *Heracles* 8. Another detail that might be considered an open tribute to Lucian, in view of the latter's *Pseudologistes*, is the use of ἀποφράδι ἡμέρᾳ (23).

64. Notably absent are such things as: latinisms (with the possible exception of εἱραμάγγας); 'objective phrases' (cf. Averil Cameron (n. 59), 75–88); οἰκεῖος = personal pronoun; ἐς with the accusative for ἐν with the dative; superlatives in a simple or comparative sense.

The older view was that it was an attack on Christianity; Reinach and others have tended to reverse that notion.[65] Macleod sensibly calls its purpose uncertain, suggesting that the first part is 'a light-hearted attack on contemporary humanists who had excessive enthusiasm for classical culture', whilst the second half 'is more serious and appeals to all patriots to support the emperor in his great campaigns'.

Given all this, some remarks on the structure of the piece are in order. Dialogue in its Platonic and Lucianic forms was a popular genre throughout the entire Byzantine period[66] and hence, on that simple reckoning, the *Philopatris* could have been produced at any time. As it stands, the title is a double one: *Philopatris or Didaskomenos*. This may amount to nothing more than another Lucianic flourish; a number of the satirist's pieces have alternate titles. Philopatris would appear to be a piece of self-advertizement for the author, to be taken along with the hint at poverty and hopes for suitable imperial largesse expressed in the final section.[67] Critias is generally taken to be the Didaskomenos, since he is given instruction in the Trinity, which suits one interpretation of the dialogue. However, he gives Triepho as much if not more information on many other matters, and leads the way in patriotism at the end. Neither character has a clear edge.

The name Critias was perhaps chosen to impart a Platonizing air to the piece,[68] and it may also suggest an identification of this character with the most vehement critic of mythological folly, Lucian himself. Perhaps the author uses the figure of Lucian *kritikos* both to assail modern enemies and also to show that the shrewd and critical pagan could come to appreciate the truths of Christianity. That all the characters except Triepho have names with similar initials (Critias, Crato, Charicenus, Chleuocharmus,

65. For a survey of opinions, with the secondary literature, see Reinach.

66. Cf. Mango (n. 20), 10, for this.

67. The author here displays his customary ineptitude. Apart from the cool-looking reference to the emperor, he has earlier (17) ascribed a house and servants to Critias, not to mention his long-standing friendship with the *peraequator* Crato.

68. In view of his frequent references to the petrifaction of Niobe, it is just conceivable that his name evokes the statue-maker Critius (Critias in some manuscripts and thus printed by Jacobitz, albeit not by Macleod in his *OCT*) mentioned in *Rhet. Praec.* 9.

Cleolaus) may be due to some fancy of the author's, or simply unconscious repetition.

Triepho is a very rare name – indeed, some older commentators wished to alter it to Tripho or Trupho. There was a philosopher called Tryphon in the third century,[69] and one also recalls Typhos from the *De providentia* of Synesius, but in view of his theological emphasis on the Trinity, it seems likely that the name was intended to connote the Trinity and his devotion to it ('Three-in-one').

The two characters are in certain ways interchangeable. Both speak in the same medley of literary tags and echoes, pagan and Christian. They both apply the image of painful pregnancy to themselves (2, 27). Triepho advises Critias to spit out his follies, μή τι κακὸν παθέῃς (2); later (18), Critias reverses the quotation upon his comrade. More signally, both swear by the Unknown God of Athens. The author makes the philhellene Critias do this first, even before he has been instructed in the Trinity. This is perhaps a sign of the author's relative indifference to consistent characterization, just as he is insouciant about the imagined physical world in which the conversation is supposed to be taking place: noted earlier were the mixture of details of the setting – variously evoking Constantinople, Athens, and Egypt – and the business of Critias' poverty. Evidently the fundamental convention of the *Philopatris* is not realism with its requirement of spatio-temporal consistency, but donnish conversation in a library of the mind. The method focuses on an admired feature of cultivated discourse in all ages – the apt quotation – and simply makes this the primary mode of speech. The ultimate case of this tendency is the cento.

With respect to the purpose of the dialogue, it may or may not be significant that the work is anonymous:[70] an attack on Christianity in any Byzantine period after Justinian's time would presumably have to be. By contrast, if the *Philopatris* belonged to the reign of Julian, one might have expected a name. However, the point cannot be pressed too much. There is more than one reason why a work might come down from antiquity in anonymous form.

The author's attitude towards Christianity is problematical. Apart from the Trinity, and the occasional details such as an oath by the Son of the Father and the injunction to use the Lord's

69. See *PLRE* (Cambridge 1971), 924.
70. As is the *Timarion*.

Prayer, there is very little of substance concerning the creed. The name of Christ is never used, our author prefers to talk about Galilaeans and the Unknown God.

The approach could be taken to suggest a situation in which Christianity was too powerful to require a detailed defence and by the same token, it might smack of indifference, if not contempt – in fact, not unlike the *Peregrinus*.

As Reinach and others have observed, an attack on pagans makes no sense after the sixth century or thereabouts, for the good reason that there were no pagans as such to attack. A Julianic date might look attractive here, or the reign of Justinian, for obvious reasons, and the references to the external enemies and frontiers would suit either of these. So might the choice of a *peraequator* to be Critias' friend, since we have seen that that official is best attested in these two periods.

But this is no sure solution either. The dangers, real or supposed, of excessive interest in Hellenism were a Byzantine theme.[71] Witness, for easy example, the warnings of men like Pachomius in the eighth century or Psellus in the eleventh, not to mention the vicious elegiac poem penned against Leo the Philosopher by a pupil, Constantine the monk, the content of which has some affinity with that of the *Philopatris*:[72]

For all the reasons put forward in this paper, it is hard to classify the dialogue as specifically anti-Christian or anti-pagan. In my opinion, the purpose, in so far as it may be said to have one, is simply to mock both – an attitude that would be as Lucianic as its language, style, and structure. Up to a point, it could have been congenial to Julian, who was quite willing in his *In Galilaeos* to admit that many Hellenic myths were incredible and monstrous.[73] Equally, it would suit a military-minded emperor with no interest in learning or culture, which is precisely the description of Basil II given by Psellus.[74] On all counts, the *Philopatris* is curiously hard to pin down. Its multiple re-impersonations of classical authors is a

71. For a survey of cases, with references, cf. S. Runciman, *Byzantine Civilisation* (London 1961), 226.

72. The poem can be read in *PG* 107.1xi–ii. It counters Hellenism with the Trinity, emphasizes the sexual side of mythology along with deceptive oracles and the like, but admits the seductiveness of Hellenic culture for the unwary.

73. *In Gal.* 44a–b.

74. *Chron.* 1.29.

technique which makes it virtually impossible (for us at least) to locate and follow a single argumentative intent. To see it as essentially a literary pastiche and uncommitted mockery may best suit its magpie structure. Nor can its date be settled. There is a case for the time of Julian, of Justinian, or anything subsequent. For the current confidence in the reign of Nicephorus Phocas, however, there is no warrant.

LXI

THE SCHOLIASTS' LUCIAN

The following choice epithets are levelled at the hapless head of Lucian the "Anti-Christ" by the Byzantine scholiasts:

1. ἄθεος
2. ἀλαζών
3. ἀλιτήριος
4. ἄνθρωπε
5. βδελυρώτατος
6. βωμολόχος
7. γελωτοποιός
8. γόης
9. δαιμόνων φίλοι
10. διαβολεύς
11. δυσσεβής
12. ἐλεεινὸς ἄνθρωπος
13. ἐμπαθέστατος
14. ἐπάρατος
15. ἐπίτριπτος
16. κακοδαίμων
17. κακὴ κεφαλή
18. κατάρατος
19. κενολόγος
20. ματαιολόγος
21. μάταιος
22. μεμψίμοιρος
23. μιαρολόγος
24. μιαρός
25. ὀλέθριος
26. ὄλεθρος
27. ὀνοματοθέτης μιαρός
28. παιγνιήμων
29. παιδοφθόρος
30. παμβέβηλος
31. πλαστογράφος
32. σκώπτης
33. ταλαίπωρος
34. ταλάντατος
35. τερατολόγος
36. τρισάθλιος
37. φιλαίτιος
38. χοιρώδης
39. ψωμοκόλαξ

Able work on the scholiasts has been done by Rabe and others [2]; and I have elsewhere disentangled the curious history of Lucian

---

[1] See H. Rabe, *Scholia in Lucianum* (1906), 336, for the list of *convicia*.

[2] See Rabe's "Die Überlieferung der Lukianscholia", *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1902), 718-36, and his "Die Lukianstudien des Arethas", *ibid.* (1903), 643-56. Also see R. Helm, *De*

the "Anti-Christ" [3]. This paper assembles the various vilipendations, and the Lucian passages which provoked them, thus enabling the reader to observe with maximum convenience the strange workings of Byzantine minds. Added, for piquancy and instruction, are references to Lucian's own use of the multifarious epithets later hurled at himself.

The numbers attached to the following sections cohere with those in the prefixed list of epithets.

1. Lucian is twice blasted as an atheist (which, in context, means "non-Christian" or "anti-Christian"—not synonymous terms); it may be surprising that the label is not attached more frequently to him. The first, and major, passage evoking scholiastic diatribe is *Philopseudes* 16, where an unnamed Syrian exorcist from Palestine is described as driving out evil spirits for large fees. It was probably the reference to Palestine which persuaded the scholiast that Christ is the intended target. The point is not so easy to decide as Harmon's dogmatic note suggests [4]. Lucian took care to mention Palestine as the country associated with Christ in *Peregrinus* 11, and he might have used the ethnic label "Syrian" loosely in context, since Jews are virtually never mentioned by him [5]. On the other hand, he makes no such accusations of venal thaumaturgy against Christ or the Christians by name. Indeed, it is the supreme irony of Lucian the "Anti-Christ" that his few positive allusions to the sect are more favourable than not [6].

The dramatic form of the *Philopseudes* probably requires a contemporary allusion. Further, the next speaker in the dialogue balances the Syrian exorcist with a mention of an equally anonymous Arab who gave him a magical ring of iron. The scholiast in his fury failed to notice that Lucian was ridiculing charlatans who prey

---

Luciani Scholiorum Fontibus (1908); R. Winter, *De Luciani scholiis quaestiones selectae* (1908); N. Nilén, "Excerpta Lucianea", *Symbolae Osloenses* (1925), 26-36; M. Wittek, "Liste des manuscrits de Lucien", *Scriptorium* 6 (1952), 309-23; M. D. Macleod's *OCT* edition of Lucian, vol. 1 (1972).

[3] In my book *Studies in Lucian* (1973).

[4] Loeb *Lucian*, vol. 3, 345.

[5] Jewish doctors appear in *Tragodopodagra* 172, contrasting with their Syrian counterparts in *Trag.* 265.

[6] *Peregrinus* 11-13; *Alexander* 25.

on the credulous, something Christ himself would not have disapproved. Also lost on the commentator is the possible humour of the Syrian satirist tilting at Syrian thaumaturges. He did not remember that Lucian elsewhere cast Syrians in similarly dubious roles; of particular relevance, apart from the afore-noted Syrian doctors routed by the goddess in the *Tragodopodagra*, is the Syrian crone who assists courtesans to recover faithless young men for only a small fee [7]. And although no Syrian, the coprophilous exorcist ridiculed in one of the epigrams ascribed to Lucian is to be subjoined [8].

Lucian is also branded as atheist for his remark in *Alexander* 60 that the seemingly providential illness and death of the false prophet, especially the discovery that he had been covering his baldness with a wig, was really due to chance. The scholiast added testily: καὶ ἀπρονόητον τὸ πᾶν. He might have paused to consider that the Christians come well out of the *Alexander* as one of the two sects opposing the fraud; doubtless he could not stomach their copulation with the Epicureans.

It is pleasant to note that the epithet "atheist" is only registered by Reitz and Jacobitz [9] in *Alexander* 25, where the false prophet claims that Pontus is full of atheists and Christians, and in *Calumnia* 14, where it is said that a slanderer will tell a godly man that his best friend is an atheist.

Supplemental to the above is the cooler reference to Lucian's atheism in one of the four scholia under the name of Basilius of Adada. It occurs in a comment on *Icaromenippus* 4. After commending Lucian's usual message about the vanity of earthly goods, Basilius takes him to task for professing not to understand the philosophic theories of the Cosmos. This reference (missed, perhaps intentionally, in Rabe's list of *convicia*) is worth noting, for the tone of Basilius' comments on Lucian tends to be markedly more temperate than that of the other commentators [10].

---

[7] *Dial. Mer.* 4. 4.

[8] *Ep.* 23 (= *A.P.* 11. 427).

[9] C. Reitz, *Lexicon Lucianeum* (1746); C. Jacobitz, *editio maior* (Teubner, 1836-41), vol. 4.

[10] Basilius' comments are on *Icaromenippus* 4; *Cataplus* 14, 24; *Convivium* 34. See N. Festa, "A proposito dei criteri per stabilire l'autenticità degli scritti compresi nel *Corpus Lucianeum*", *Mélanges Bidez* (1934), vol. 1, 377-95.

2. Lucian receives this epithet in a splendidly abusive passage on *Peregrinus* 11, where the wisdom of the Christians is introduced as "wondrous". This pamphlet was, of course, absurdly responsible for much of the vituperation of Lucian.

Aristophanes used the epithet against sophists [11]; Lucian himself (partly influenced by the former) frequently applies it to false philosophers (*Piscator* 21, 29, 37; *Bis Accusatus* 11; *Hermotimus* 12; *Gallus* 4). The biter bit!

3. Lucian is thus stigmatised three times. First, for his comic rigmarole in *Muscae Laudatio* 7, in which his demonstration of the immortality of the fly's soul is used to confirm the tale of the wandering soul of Hermotimus of Clazomenae. It is possible that the commentator felt this anecdote had some bearing on Lucian's Hermotimus (the central figure in his longest extant piece, who is converted to scepticism), and so worked himself up into more of a lather than he otherwise might have done. More to the point, the outburst is a fine testimony to the literal-minded inability of a Byzantine scholiast to discern an adoxographical joke [12]. The second occasion is in the aforementioned section of *Philopseudes* 16. The third bears on *Demosthenis Encomium* 50, where the conceit of the dead orator gone to be an attendant on Zeus is taken as blasphemous. Perhaps all that can be said of this is that most scholars, except myself [13], would regard the ultimate blasphemy as attributing this very dialogue to Lucian.

Nicely enough, Lucian has himself attacked with this epithet by Socrates in the opening sentences of the *Piscator*; Hermes applies it to a tyrant who tries to escape from Hades in *Cataplus* 3. In view of this recurrent phenomenon of the satirist's use of the labels later attached to himself, one might wish to credit the commentators with deliberately using Lucian's not inconsiderable arsenal of abuse against him. There is not much else for which to commend them.

4. An untypically mild interjection or ejaculation, included in a comment on *Amores* 41, where there is a comic description of big-

---

[11] *Nub.* 102.

[12] See A. S. Pease, "Things without Honor", *Class. Phil.* 21 (1926), 27-42.

[13] See my article "The Authorship and Purpose of Lucian's *Demosthenis Encomium*", *Antichthon* 3 (1969), 54-62.

breasted women in unappetising finery. The scholiast discusses the offending passage with the lubricious care of gutter-newspapers which thrive on the vices they profess to condemn.

Lucian quite frequently uses the interjection (e.g., *Navigium* 21; *Dial. Mer.* 9. 4); once, at least, with effective humour in *Dial. Deor.* 4. 1, where Ganymede addresses it to Zeus.

5. The malediction was inspired by *Hermotimus* 66, where Hermotimus echoes the argument of Lycinus (= Lucian) that no school of philosophy leads to the discovery of truth. The scholiast's objection to such a conclusion is predictable, though he might have drawn comfort from Hermotimus' words by reflecting that the "true religion" provided the solace that "pagan" philosophy could not.

Lucian could not fairly have objected to this particular epithet, since he flung it, in both simple and superlative forms, at his enemy in *Pseudologistes* 3, 19.

6. This is the commonest insult hurled against Lucian; it is employed on ten occasions:

Muscae Laudatio 7: already discussed.

Vera Historia 2. 2, 31: the first of these passages has the tall story in which the narrator and his comrades spend thirty days in a cave dug into the frozen sea warming themselves over a fire, after which the wind drops and they glide away on the ice. The commentator cannot understand why the adventurers' fire did not melt the ice. Just as well for Lucian, one feels, that he did not use forty days as the waiting period; then he really would have been assailed by our pious pedants! In the second passage, Lucian has found that in Hades the most condign punishments of all are reserved for liars such as Ctesias and Herodotus (this copulation is in itself a nice joke wasted on the scholiast). The comment is that, if this is so, what sort of fate can possibly be awaiting Lucian for his fabrications in the *Vera Historia*? The scholiast's lack of humour contrasts unfavourably with Photius, who discusses the *VH* with apparent relish; the Patriarch, to be sure, had a weakness for the novel form, except when "obscene" matter intruded [14].

Cataplus 14: the commonplace homily on how a tyrant hates to be robbed by death of his handsome catamites arouses the usual

---

[14] *Bibliotheca, Cod.* 129 (on Lucian); *Cod.* 73 (his delight in Heliodorus); *Cod.* 87 (criticism of the sexual element in Achilles Tatius).

scholiastic accusation that Lucian himself was a pederast; the *locus classicus* for this is *Convivium* 39, and will be discussed later.

Icaromenippus 27: Lucian's paraphrase of the Homeric account of Olympian menus is too much for the commentator's digestion.

Charon 4: Hermes' little joke on how much easier it was for Homer to pile Pelion upon Ossa in a couple of verses than for those who have to do the job literally is converted into a blasphemy of "the most sacred things of the Greeks". This is one of the more interesting idiocies, for it need not reflect only the reaction of an affronted Christian.

Rhetorum Praeceptor 17: Lucian's ironic dismissal of the styles of Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Plato is taken as a serious attack on the three. Recognition of irony is not one of the scholiasts' strong points.

De Dea Syria 60: the writer's claim to have fastened a dedicatory lock of his young hair in the temple, along with carving his name, inspired the commentator to wish various horrible fates upon Lucian.

Saturnalia 8: the Priest's claim that, if Cronos had released one of his robots of beaten gold into the world, it would have been ripped apart by men, suffering the fate of a Pentheus or an Actaeon, prompts the wish that Lucian himself be flung to the proverbial crows. The context recalls the fate of Lucian in the *Suda* [15].

Apologia 10: Lucian enumerates old age, disease, and poverty as possible justifications for the acceptance of his new position. The commentator, who roars against this, is not alone in condemning Lucian for his "selling-out", though he ignores the fact that Lucian goes on to say that he will not actually adduce any of these arguments.

Lucian uses this much-touted epithet in *De Mercede Conductis* 24, and the cognate adjective in *De Historia Conscribenda* 17 and *Hermotimus* 58. It may seem unnerving that the scholiasts' favourite term of abuse, for Lucian of all people, is "flatterer"; those who recall the *Imagines*, however, may not find it altogether misplaced.

7. This term is twice used against Lucian. Once in the above passage from *Saturnalia* 8, and also for the joke about Peregrinus' cautious pulling of his own hair (*Peregrinus* 6).

Lucian himself uses the epithet several times, also the cognate noun and verb (*Convivium* 18, 20; *VH* 2. 18; *Gallus* 11; *Bis Accus.* 33; *De Saltatione* 68; *Prometheus* 6).

---

[15] Euripides and Heracleitus also meet this fate in "biography".

8. Another of the commonest labels attached to the satirist: *Vera Historia* 1. 17; 2. 11, 31: the first of these passages gets Lucian into trouble for his invention of donkey-trumpeters. It does not occur to the commentator, the most asinine character of all, that (apart from the obvious humour of the conceit) Lucian was probably playing on the "ass on the lyre" tag, which is one he was fond of using against personal targets (*Adversus Indoctum* 4; *Pseudologistes* 7). More serious is the second passage, containing Lucian's elaborate fantasy of the golden city on the island of the Blessed; the scholiast was disposed to see it as a parody on the New Jerusalem. The third passage was discussed earlier, in the βωμολόχος section.

Jupiter Tragoedus 28: in one of the more inscrutable attacks, Lucian is castigated for making Momus ironically praise Apollo for commending clarity of diction. This classic piece of Lucianic advice (see, e.g., *Lexiphanes* 23) is badly needed by his detractors.

Charon 4: already discussed in the βωμολόχος section.

Rhetorum Praeceptor 17: the previous comment again obtains.

Alexander 8, 53: in both passages, it is Lucian's irreverent attitude to oracles (the ancient Greek ones and Alexander's own confections respectively) which earns him condemnation (cf. the *Jupiter Tragoedus* passage above). These seem to be further examples of criticisms not necessarily inspired by Christian sentiment.

The epithet in question is one which Lucian employed frequently against philosophers (*Piscator* 25; *Gallus* 4), their epigones (*Piscator* 42), and, of course, false prophets (*Alexander* 25, 60).

9. This vituperative label is attached to Lucian in the outbursts against his supposed pederastic proclivities in *Convivium* 39, a matter already noted and to be further discussed.

It is possible that the epithet was inspired by the phrase φίλιοι δαίμονες, used in *Toxaris* 7 to translate the Scythian title Κόραχοι bestowed on Orestes and Pylades. In the rival, but related, contexts of friendship and pederasty, the inspiration would be logical, even happy.

10. It is perhaps surprising that Lucian is only so stigmatised twice. Not at all surprising is the fact that both occasions were prompted by the *Peregrinus*. First, for his account of how the poor people of Paros hailed Peregrinus for proclaiming his transference of his patrimony to the state (*Peregrinus* 15). Second, for repeating the charge of parricide against Peregrinus (*Peregrinus* 21).

It is notable that neither case has to do with Lucian's formal comments on Christ or Christianity. One should recall that Lucian's hostility to Peregrinus is offset by Aulus Gellius' admiration and later sources [16]; these may have helped to convince the commentators of Peregrinus' sincerity.

The epithet is not attested in Lucian, nor does the Lexicon register it.

11. This malediction is hurled at Lucian in the preamble to a lengthy diatribe by Arethas [17], inspired by Lucian's mockery of the concept of Zeus as captain of the ship of the universe (*Jupiter Tragoedus* 47). It is also used more casually in a note on *Scytha* 9 concerning Lucian's birthplace and nationality.

Reitz and Jacobitz register only one Lucianic use of the word (*Asinus* 41), applied to temple robbers.

12. The phrase is condescendingly used in a long note by Arethas on Lucian's equally superior attitude to Christian belief in the immortality of the soul in *Peregrinus* 13. To be fair to Arethas, he can rise above the level of simple abuse, and may have been capable of adapting the satirist's tone quite consciously in his rebuttals.

This last claim may be enhanced by the fact that the only use of the adjective in question registered by Reitz and Jacobitz is in *Necyomanteia* 14, where it is applied to the tortures of the damned in the underworld. The commentators' hoped-for fate of Lucian in the Christian equivalent is no secret.

13. An epithet applied to the satirist for his ironic comments in *De Domo* 4 on Socrates' ironic references to invoking the Muses in Plato's *Phaedrus* 229. It has already been observed that one stroke of irony is usually too much for the scholiasts: two are quite beyond them.

The adjective seems not to have been used by Lucian.

---

[16] Aulus Gellius, *NA* 12. 1; Tatian, *Or. ad Graecos* 25; Athenagoras, *Legat. de Christianis* 26; Tertullian, *Ad Martyres* 4; Eusebius, *Chron.* 2. 170 (Schöne). One of the Philostrati wrote a biography of Peregrinus. See G. Bagnani, "Peregrinus Proteus and the Christians", *Historia* 4 (1955), 107-12.

[17] Preserved independently in *Mosquensis* 315 (16th century); see Rabe, iv, and the Teubner *Arethas* of L. G. Westerlink, *Arethae Scripta Minora*, vol. 1 (1968).

14. This is another malediction against Lucian's alleged pederasty; not, for once, used against *Convivium* 39, but in a note on *Amores* 54.

Again, the epithet is not registered for Lucian. It was used in formal contexts by Thucydides and Plato.

15. The commentator applied this epithet in his belief that Lucian's statement concerning monotheism in *Icaromenippus* 9 was a possible tilt against Moses. Arethas throws the superlative form against the satirist in the above-mentioned diatribe on *Peregrinus* 13.

By coincidence or otherwise, there are two examples of the word in Lucian, one simple and one superlative. The former is applied by Zeus to Damis the Epicurean in *Jupiter Tragoedus* 16; the latter by Timon to the parasitic Gnathonides (*Timon* 46).

16. This adjective is employed in a note on *Bis Accusatus* 14, in which the commentator makes the earth-shattering discovery that the unnamed orator on trial is really Lucian! It is also applied in a railing comment on a bit of alliteration given by Lucian to Lexiphanes (*Lexiphanes* 15). These examples, which have little or no bearing on Lucian's actual text, indicate how close some of the commentators had come to mechanical application of insult to the satirist.

Of the several examples of the epithet in Lucian, *Lexiphanes* 25 is perhaps the most relevant, since it may indicate yet again how the scholiasts were wont to hoist Lucian with his own petards, for Lucian here uses it of infelicitous diction, just as the commentator does on *Lexiphanes* 15.

17. This pleasant phrase is used in the aforementioned diatribe against *Muscae Laudatio* 7.

Herodotus has the phrase in the plural (3. 29), and there are similar expressions in Aristophanes (μιαρὰ κεφαλή in *Ach.* 285, used against Lucian in a commentator's note on *Peregrinus* 13) and Demosthenes.

18. Another of the more frequent taunts:

Jupiter Tragoedus 47: employed in the Arethas diatribe, already discussed.

Vitarum Auctio 21: Lucian is taken to task for his mockery of the Stoic distinctions between predications.

Parasitus 41, 43: Arethas was upset by the first of these passages, in which the good looks of the typical parasite are ironically

lauded. The second passage caused offence for its (admittedly) foolish crack against the flight of Socrates from the battle of Delium.

Amores 36: the usual spleen against male homosexuality.

Peregrinus 15, 41: the first of these passages has been discussed. The second consists of a series of sarcastic prophecies by Lucian on the miracles and honours which will gather around the tomb and name of Peregrinus, in particular the forecast that bees will settle on the tomb.

De Historia Conscribenda 15: Lucian's sneer at the style of Crepereius Calpurnianus' Parthian history, specifically for the latter's Thucydidean pastiche on the Athenian dead at Nisibis, is met with the comment that the satirist always delights in profiting from another's woes. The observation is far from untrue, but the chosen context for it is absurd.

Lucian has Plato revile him with this insult in *Piscator* 15, and then, nicely, has Plato use it against a greedy Platonist (*Piscator* 49). Timon applies it to a corrupt servant who despoils his master (*Timon* 14); this context conforms to the commentator's animadversion in the previous paragraph.

19. The miraculous parting of the waters in *Vera Historia* 2. 43 is taken as a possible allusion to the story of Moses and the Red Sea. It is notable that none of the scholiasts took the whale episode in *VH* 1. 31 as a parody of Jonah.

The adjective is very rare, and not used by Lucian; Plutarch has the cognate noun, and Eupolis the verb.

20. Lucian's joke against the historian whose title is almost as long as his book (*De Historia Conscribenda* 30) provoked the commentator into wondering if Lucian himself would ever stop. Stop what? Writing, or insulting?

The epithet is rare, but is, significantly, in the New Testament; Lucian does not employ it.

21. Four passages provoke this adjective (the superlative is also used in the previously discussed *Peregrinus* 13). Quotations from Euripides in *Jupiter Tragoedus* 41, adduced by Damis the Epicurean, provoke the commentator into joining Lucian's discussion of the sincerity of Euripides' comments on the gods. The note is a rare example of a scholiastic effort to argue rather than to abuse, though the insult is present and the conclusion reached absurd. Chrysippus' eulogy of Plato (*Piscator* 22) is rightly taken as ironic

(a rare perception), and hence denounced as an insult. *Parasitus* 6 (on the need for regular exercise of the parasite's art) evokes another outburst against the "ethos" of this dialogue. Finally, a case where the scholiast might have outdone Lucian. *De Luctu* 14 discusses men who try "to take it with them" by burning or sacrificing favourite clothes, horses, or concubines. The commentator drily observes that their real motive is to ensure that no one else will be able to enjoy them.

Lucian uses the epithet in personal abuse (*Cataplus* 14; *De Mercede Conductis* 17).

22. This pejorative is thrown at Lucian for the passage on old age in *Apologia* 10, which was discussed earlier.

A seemingly piquant, but not unfair, comment to make about the satirist, who is naturally free in his own employment of it (*Timon* 13; *Piscator* 34; *Jupiter Tragoedus* 40; *Bis Accusatus* 2; etc.).

23. The insult is provoked by a passage in *Amores* 35, dealing yet again with male homosexuality.

The epithet is unprecedented [18]; μιαρόγλωσσος was registered by the Lexicon in *A.P.* 7. 377.

24. Quite a favourite with the commentators, a point enhanced by its extension into other phrases and compounds. The simple adjective is used five times:

Alexander 40: the mock oracle issued to settle the question of whose soul Alexander possessed is lambasted for its claim that the prophet's soul will be struck by a bolt and return to Zeus. Once again, Lucian's humour is wasted.

Eunuchus 12: a joke about genital philosophy earns predictable disapproval.

Amores 54: the above-mentioned pederastic reference.

Peregrinus 11: already discussed.

De Historia Conscribenda 29: a sarcasm on the martial valour of a stay-at-home historian is condemned for its tone. Well, at least the commentator recognised irony for once.

25. This variant on the following epithet is employed in a note on *Peregrinus* 11 (already discussed), and in a rather interesting dissection of the last scene in the *Menippus* (*Menippus* 22). The

---

[18] Not registered until the *Supplement* to the LSJ Lexicon.

Chaldean sage, Mithrobarzanes, who has been Menippus' escort to Hades, shows Lucian's hero the exit to Lebadeia from the underworld by taking him to a particularly dark spot and pointing with his finger to a pinprick of light in the distance. The scholiast asks how a motion of the finger could be detected in the darkness, and concludes that Lucian is making fun of Trophonius. This literal approach to humour has been observed before, notably in comments on the *Vera Historia*. Lucian consecrated *Dial. Mort.* 10 to ridicule of Trophonius; the scholiast on this mentions that the old site of the oracle had become sacred to Saint Christopher, which fact would account for the comment on the *Menippus* passage.

Lucian applies the pejorative to Paphlagonians (*Alexander* 11), deceased potentates (*Dial. Mort.* 2. 1), and Cleon (*De Historia Conscribenda* 38); the usage is not common [19].

26. Lucian is so labelled for the above-mentioned passage from *Saturnalia* 8, and also in an unusually apt comment on *Hermotimus* 81, in which Lucian's jest on a character who spoils dinners by parading knowledge before those who do not need it is transferred to the satirist.

The idiom is not in Lucian, but is not uncommon [20].

27. The epithet, quite appropriate to Lucian, is evoked by Philosophy's trick (*Fugitivi* 26) of bestowing names connoting greed on the runaways. The close link between this dialogue and the *Peregrinus* should be borne in mind.

Lucian did not use this noun; Jacobitz (though not Reitz) read the cognate verb in *Rhetorum Praeceptor* 17, but the text is uncertain. Plato has the noun (*Charmides* 175B). Both noun and verb were thought worthy of discussion by Phrynichus [21].

28. Twice employed. The fruit-bearing ship's mast in *Vera Historia* 2. 41 was taken to be a parody of Aaron's rod. In *Lexiphanes* 4, the application of the verb ἀπερυθριᾶσαι is commended (an unusual phenomenon) as appropriate in context.

Lucian does not have the word, but it occurs in an unflattering context in Herodotus (2. 173).

---

[19] The Lexicon gives only the *DM* and *DHC* references in this sense; both Reitz and Jacobitz omit the *DHC* passage.

[20] Demosthenes applied it to Aeschines "the clerk".

[21] Lobel 668.

29. Applied to *Convivium* 39, the *locus classicus* for Lucian the pederast. The commentators are not, of course, alone in the delusion that an artist's real character can be deduced from his work, although in the case of a satirist the error is especially crass. Nowadays, one hopes, it is of interest rather than concern whether or not Lucian liked boys [22]. Lucian may have had a son (*Eunuchus* 13), even a wife [23]; he could still have been bisexual. But, for what it is worth, he was capable of jokes against male homosexuality (*Vitarum Auctio* 18; *Dial. Deorum* 12. 1) more hostile than the present passage and the other ones singled out by the commentators.

The epithet is not in Lucian; it, and the cognate verb, are used by Clement of Alexandria (85. 223), and are regarded as ecclesiastical by the Lexicon.

30. The adjective is used in the previously discussed passage from *Vitarum Auctio* 15.

Again, we have a non-Lucianic term, regarded by the Lexicon as ecclesiastical [24].

31. Employed in a note on *Charon* 4 (already discussed).

The word is not in Lucian; it is found in Manetho (2. 305) and Artemidorus (1. 51).

32. Twice used, in passages already reviewed (*Peregrinus* 15, 21). It may be notable that the insult is coupled in both cases with the two examples of διαβολεύς.

The noun is not in Lucian, and is very rare [25]. The verb is common in Lucian (*Bacchus* 8; *Vitarum Auctio* 24; *Parasitus* 51; *Demosthenis Encomium* 44; *Dial. Deorum* 16. 3), and the cognate adjective is in *Demosthenis Encomium* 33.

33. This denunciation is hurled at Lucian for his joke in *De Historia Conscribenda* 26 on the tasteless historian's account of the burial of Severianus. "Enough is enough" is the view of the com-

---

[22] For the opposite conclusion to that of the scholiasts, see J. J. Chapman, *Lucian, Plato, and Greek Morals* (1931). The basic texts are the *Amores* and *Charidemus*, not usually accepted as Lucianic (see Macleod, Loeb *Lucian*, vol. 8, 147-8; 467).

[23] There is a vague reference to "my father and my family" in *Alexander* 56.

[24] Registered in an anonymous item in the *Suda*, s.v. Κωνσταντῖνος.

[25] *Etymologicum Magnum* 593. 7.

mentator of Lucian's mockery. The aforementioned comment on *DHC* 15 (again in the context of tasteless accounts of burials) should be compared.

Lucian has the simple form of the adjective, applied to the physical woes of the gouty victim in *Tragodopodagra* 16.

34. This superlative is evoked by the claim in *Peregrinus* 16, that Peregrinus sponged of Christian charity.

Lucian has the simple form in a sympathetic sense in *Dial. Mer.* 10. 3; the bad sense is as old as Homer (*Od.* 19. 68).

35. Evoked by *Vera Historia* 2. 17 (previously discussed), and by the statement in *Peregrinus* 12 that the villain was dubbed "the new Socrates" by the Christians.

The word is not registered in Lucian, but he has the cognate verb in *Philopseudes* 37. The verb is also found in the spurious *Philopatris*, as is the relevant noun (*Philopatris* 10, 2).

36. The joke on Plato's *Republic* (*Vitarum Auctio* 17) and its plethora of laws is virulently turned against the satirist ("Woe unto you, Lucian, for your laws.").

Perhaps significantly, Lucian has the epithet in *Gallus* 24, in the context of an unhappy king.

37. Inspired by *Apologia* 10 (already discussed).

The adjective is not in Lucian, but was common in Attic prose.

38. This strong term occurs in the lengthy diatribe on *Jupiter Tragoedus* 47, which has already been assessed.

The Lexicon registers the epithet as a speciality of John Chrysostom, and ecclesiastical writing in general.

39. The insult was prompted by *Icaromenippus* 27 (already reviewed).

The word is not in Lucian; as its alliterative form suggests, it comes from comedy (Ar. *Frag.* 213).

Lucian emerges from all this verbal flak as a most versatile villain. The general picture is all too clear. For all that, some supplemental and concluding remarks will be in order.

The provenance of each comment need not be registered; the reader will consult Rabe's edition. It may be noted that the *convicia* derive from comments deployed across twenty-nine dialogues: *Alexander*; *Apologia*; *Amores*; *Bis Accusatus*; *Cataplus*; *Charon*;

Convivium; *Demosthenis Encomium*; *De Dea Syria*; *De domo*; *Eunuchus*; *Fugitivi*; *Hermotimus*; *De Historia Conscribenda*; *Icaromenippus*; *Jupiter Tragoedus*; *Lexiphanes*; *De Luctu*; *Muscae Laudatio*; *Menippus*; *Philopseudes*; *Peregrinus*; *Parasitus*; *Piscator*; *Rhetorum Praeceptor*; *Saturnalia*; *Scytha*; *Vera Historia*; *Vitarum Auctio*. The *Philopatris* is (mercifully) irrelevant, since it was usually thought to be non-Lucianic, and there are no *scholia* pertinent to the issue.

The *Peregrinus* is cardinal to Lucian's emergence as the "Anti-Christ". It is also at the core of the malicious "biography" of Lucian offered by the *Suda*. An absurd situation, since Lucian in no way defames Christ (except by calling him the "crucified sophist"), and is more complimentary than not to the Christians, save for the caustic reference to their belief in the immortality of the soul. His target is Peregrinus, and Peregrinus only. In tracing allusions to Christianity and the Old Testament, the commentators were probably giving Lucian far too much credit. For he did not really have much interest in the sect, and his knowledge of their books and beliefs was no greater than that evinced by, say, Tacitus, Pliny, or Fronto. Unless the scholiast was right in thinking that the Celsus who is the recipient of the *Alexander* was in fact the anti-Christian intellectual confuted by Origen [26]. If that equation is correct, we might assume that Celsus supplied Lucian with his knowledge of Christianity and the Old Testament.

Lucian's supposed animosity to Christianity turns out to be only a small part of the story. He is castigated for his jokes on Greek religion and philosophy, for his excessive attacks on individuals, and for his supposed pederasty.

The commentators display two notable qualities: failure to recognise irony (though sometimes it is detected by them), and a literalminded seriousness in the presence of humour (this is especially true in their comments on the fabrications of the *Vera Historia*).

To be fair, some of the scholiasts rose above the general level. Arethas and Basilius were capable of rational argument, and there

---

[26] In general, see H. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und Das Neue Testament* (1961). For literature on the Celsus issue see, e. g., M. Caster, *Études sur Alexandre ou le Faux Prophète de Lucien* (1938); H. Chadwick, *Origen, Contra Celsum* (1953), xxxv-xl; W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the early Church* (1965). T. Keim, *Celsus' Wahres Wort* (1873), accepted the identification.

is an occasionally effective joke on Lucian [27]. It has also been seen that many of the insults levelled at Lucian were used by the satirist himself, and this may be a deliberate technique. By the same token, a number of non-Lucianic epithets belong to ecclesiastical Greek vocabulary rather than to classical Greek.

The scholiasts' Lucian in the Lucian of the *Suda*, a notably different character from the Lucian of Lactantius, Isidore of Pelusium, and Photius. In the sense that no one nowadays believes in Lucian the "Anti-Christ", the issue may seem a dead one. Yet it had a long innings, being once potent enough to get Lucian included in the Catholic *Index*, and to evoke a Jesuite drama in the eighteenth century [28]. One also recalls Erasmus' enthusiasm for the satirist, and the criticisms evoked by that [29]. Hence, it was worthwhile to assemble the details of the myth's creation, and kill it of once and for all by precise dissection.

---

[27] For instance, a prefatory note to the *Adversus Indoctum* claims that Lucian's pamphlet was probably inspired by the victim's refusal to lend Lucian a book. The comments on *Alexander* 38 indicate awareness of Lucian's humorous techniques, and a willingness to argue rather than to cast stones.

[28] This engaging item was entitled *Lucianus Samosatenus Infelix Atheus*, produced on September 3, 1766, at Regensburg by the *Lyceum und Gymnasium Societatis Jesu*.

[29] See C. R. Thompson, *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More* (1940), 44-5.

LXII

THE DATE OF ALCIPHRON

Alciphron has never been dated with precision. Not a great matter in itself: Alciphron is not important enough for that. But it would be useful to have a clue, since it bears upon the perennial problem of his literary relationship with Lucian[1].

Ep. 4, 19, 7, a confection from Glycera to the playwright Menander, may afford such a clue. In the course of her letter, Glycera writes: Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' εἴγε ἄρα πόθος αἱρεῖ σέ τις καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀγαθῶν καὶ εἰ μηδενὸς ἄλλου τῆς γε Αἰγύπτου, χρήματος μεγάλου, καὶ τῶν αὐτόθι πυραμίδων καὶ τῶν ἠχούντων ἀγαλμάτων καὶ τοῦ περιβοήτου λαβυρίνθου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων δσα ὑπὸ χρόνου ἢ τέχνης παρ' αὐτοῖς τίμια, δέομαί σου, Μένανδρε, μὴ ποιήσῃ με πρόφασιν. The singing statues must allude to the famous Memnon, whose performances attracted tourists in great numbers, many of whom carved graffiti upon him to express their admiration; the datable ones range from the first century A. D. to, probably, February 24/25, 196[2]. Textbooks[3] confidently state that Memnon lost his voice after being repaired by Septimius Severus in 202. It comes as something of a shock to realise that this rests not only upon the unique testimony of the *Historia Augusta*, which is bad enough, but upon the words (culminating the imperial travelogue) *nam et Memphim et Memnonem et pyramides et labyrinthum diligenter inspexit*[4]. On this evidence alone, it might be inferred simply that Septimius duly attended one of Memnon's recitals, as Hadrian had done before.

Nevertheless, correlation of this with the drying-up of graffiti does imply that something happened to Memnon's voice in this period. Alciphron's phraseology suggests that he was writing at a time when the statue was still in good voice. It is not an anachronism dredged up to fit Menander, for the

[1] Fully explored, with detailed bibliography, in the Loeb edition (1949) of BENNER-FOBES, concluding thus: »A *terminus ante quem* for the life of Alciphron is therefore still to seek.« Cf. SCHMID's notice in *PW* 1, 1548–1549.

[2] Or exasperation, when he remained silent (as sometimes happened). For the inscriptions (*CIG* 3. 4719–4761; *CIL* 3. 30–66), cf. A. and E. BERNARD, Les Inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon (Cairo, 1960). There is a possibility that the date of *CIL* 3. 52 could be moved back to A. D. 205 (cf. *CIL* 3, p. 968).

[3] For easy instance, A. R. BIRLEY, Septimius Severus (London, 1971), 207; H. M. D. PARKER, A History of the Roman World A. D. 138–337 (2nd ed., London, 1958), 71.

[4] *HA, Sev.* 17. 4; no mention in Dio's account (75, 13, 1–3) of the emperor in Egypt, nor in Herodian.

phenomenon is not attested before Strabo[5]. On these reckonings, Alciphron will have written not later than the first decade of the third century.

[5] Strabo 17, 816; cf. Pausanias 1, 42, 3; Philostratus, *VA* 6, 4. For a detailed account (albeit not always accurate), see L. Casson, Travel in the Ancient World (Toronto, 1974), 260–261, 272–278, 284–285.

LXIII
THE FIRST AND ONLY

M. N. Tod long ago[1]) drew attention to 36 inscriptions containing the interchangeable[2]) expressions *πρῶτος καὶ μόνος* or *μόνος καὶ πρῶτος*, remarking that this usage "suggests a weakness of thought and expression on the part of the Greeks."

More recently, J. Duffy[3]) had occasion to point out that Galen was once praised by Marcus Aurelius as *τῶν μὲν ἰατρῶν πρῶτον, τὸν δὲ φιλοσόφων μόνον*, citing an anonymous referee of his paper for the view that this accolade was a variation on the *πρῶτος καὶ μόνος* formula in Aeschines, *In Ctes.* 77.

In view of Tod's statistics, it is not idle pedantry to observe that Aeschines actually has the sequence *μόνος καὶ πρῶτος*, applying it to the deceased daughter of Demosthenes, the only and first to call him "father." Though itself a variation on the inscriptional formula, this passage has little direct bearing on Marcus Aurelius and Galen.

Far more to the point is Lucian, *Demonax* 29, where that witty man deflates the boast of Agathocles the Peripatetic that he is *μόνος καὶ πρῶτος* of the dialecticians by observing *εἰ μὲν πρῶτος, οὐ μόνος, εἰ δὲ μόνος, οὐ πρῶτος*. Given their mutual dates, this strongly suggests that "First and Only" or "Only and First" were common

[1]) 'Greek Record-Keeping and Record-Breaking,' *CQ* 43 (1949), 111–12.

[2]) *Μόνος* comes before *πρῶτος* on 22 of the 36 occasions.

[3]) 'Philologica Byzantina,' *GRBS* 21 (1980), 266–7.

boasts or unofficial titles in the second century A. D. amongst doctors and philosophers. Agathocles indeed, like Galen, could have been both, if he is equated with the homonymous doctor in Lucian, *Catapl.* 6.

In cutting Agathocles down to size, Demonax showed that, despite Tod, at least one Greek was alert to the illogicality of the formula. Moreover, in these circumstances, it is nice to reflect that Demonax was the first but not the only one to make the point. Many centuries later, the Byzantine *savant* Michael Italicus[4]) commended the medical man Leipsiotes as *πρῶτος καὶ μόνος*, immediately adding the pre-emptive *καὶ μή μοι τοῦτο πρόφερε· εἰ πρῶτος, πῶς μόνος; καὶ εἰ μόνος, πῶς πρῶτος*; we are left with the strong impression that both title and joke were common in later Roman and Byzantine intellectual circles,[5]) thereby justifying Duffy's explanation of *μόνος* as a medical title against earlier critics who preferred to change the texts.

ATHENAEUS

LXIV

ATHENAEUS AND HIS WORK

A diffuse antiquarian, to be consulted for the remains of Middle and New Comedy, and savoured as a dispenser of curious lore. That is how men usually regard Athenaeus of Naucratis – if they regard him at all. Editors of his brobdingnagian compilation, from Casaubon to Kaibel, have conspired to reinforce this view. And almost all of what little has been written about the *Deipnosophistae* outside the commentaries dwells exclusively on the minutiae of text and culinary detail.[1]

The focus has been needlessly narrow, to the detriment of proper knowledge and appreciation. It says something about the situation that the very title of Athenaeus' work could persist in mistranslation through every edition of Liddell-Scott-Jones, until the *Supplement* brought overdue correction.[2]

However, there are richer rewards than mere censure of constriction and mumpsimus. A good deal can be disclosed or clarified, or at least plausibly tendered. And without recourse to hypersubtle reconstruction or inference. All that is required is a willingness to read the text of Athenaeus thoroughly, the assistance of other sources (old and new[3]) of knowledge, and the abandonment of antique conjectures that have attained the rank of fact in the standard accounts.

Take the author himself, for first and easy instance. Athenaeus, in terms of completing his book, tends to be located vaguely towards the end of the Severan period. That rests solely on the assumption that the Ulpian of his dialogue is the celebrated jurist, slain in 228. This procedure is facilitated by

1. This is no lax claim, drummed up to exalt the originality of the present paper Engelmann-Preuss, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum* (Leipzig, 1880), registered only 52 papers on Athenaeus for the period 1700–1878, mostly in German or Latin. For 1896–1914, Lambrino found only 30, four of which are in English. Marouzeau has 19 for the decade 1914–1924, including three in English. The average annual harvest from *L'Année Philologique* (in any tongue) is three or less. The notice by Wentzel in *Pauly-Wissowa* was brief (2, cols. 2026–2033). To be exempted from these strictures is W. Dittenberger, 'Athenaeus und sein Werk', *Apophoreton* (1903), 1; he saw the problems and anticipated some of my conclusions. But we have learned much in the 70 years since Dittenberger published his paper.

2. The title was translated as 'Learned in the mysteries of the kitchen'; the *Supplement* renders 'Learned Diners'. The distinction is hardly trivial.

3. Epigraphic, of course, for the most part. The reader will constantly be referred to the fundamental G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), henceforth cited by the author's name. A useful and up-dated résumé is provided by Bowersock and others in *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (American Philological Association, Pennsylvania, 1974).

ignorance, at least in the case of the Loeb editor, of the exiguous but suggestive notice of Athenaeus in the *Suda*.[4] We shall see that it is possible to be somewhat more scientific than that.

The same holds for the characters of his banquet. Kaibel[5] maintained that most of them were fictions, derived or compounded from great names of the past. It is a view that has exerted two kinds of influence, both unfortunate. The Budé editor[6] reproduces Kaibel's notions with servility. Gulick of the Loeb[7] rightly contested a number of these fantasies, but succumbed to a complexity of his own devising: Athenaeus' practice was 'to take a well-known historical personage and attribute to him different traits from those he was known to possess'. That credo has a perverse charm, but will get us nowhere slowly.

Athenaeus was not always in firm control of his teeming pages, but he did not stand in permanent awe of his antiquities or his mentors. An element of mockery is frequently paraded. Ridicule of extreme Atticists and pedantry is a major theme. These contentions will be documented in due season. To the conclusion that Athenaeus was no stuffy polyhistor. Rather, he employed the motif of learned table talk to satirical ends, in the manner of Lucian's *Convivium*. The presence (albeit a muted one) at his banquet of Galen, another noted deflater of linguistic and intellectual pretension, may enhance the interpretation.

Athenaeus was not one of those Hellenic or Hellenised creatures who affected not to have noticed the phenomenon of Rome. He stands rather in the tradition of Plutarch (as with Galen, the appearance of a Plutarch in his dialogue may be construed as a hint) and, in his own time, Dio Cassius. The banquet is set in Rome, at the season of a Roman festival, with a Roman host. Great figures from Rome's past, notably Scipio Aemilianus, are adduced on occasion. So are a few emperors, from Augustus to Commodus. Many references to Roman *mores* are inserted, by no means all of them uncomplimentary.

Above all, there is frequent discussion of Latin words and meanings, with no obvious attitude of contempt. In fact, one sharp exchange is tailored to produce a defence of Latin expertise.[8] The world had moved far, and in the right direction, from Apollonius of Tyana's condemnation of Roman nomenclature amongst Greeks and the golden-mouthed Dio's apologies for having to mention such 'modern' names as that of the emperor Nero[9]. As in the case of Dio Cassius, whose knowledge of Latin appears to have extended beyond his

4. C. B. Gulick, Introd., viii.
5. Teubner edition, *Praef.*, vi.
6. A. M. Desrousseaux, Introd., xii–xix.
7. *Ibid.*, xi–xii.
8. 3.121f.
9. Philostratus, *VA* 4.5; Dio, *Or.* 21.11.

Roman source materials to the poetry of Virgil,[10] Athenaeus clearly concedes the reality and health of bilingualism and biculturalism.[11]

Which attitude is redolent of the Antonine and Severan eras. If the phrase has not been debased beyond meaning, Athenaeus was the product of his age. But his interest for modern students of his times does not stop here. He and his deipnosophists serve to expand the Philostratean version of the intellectual history of the period. Various small details, notably those pertaining to fashions in luxury then current in Rome, are of interest to students of Dio Cassius and the accursed *Historia Augusta*.[12] So are some larger items, such as the host Larensios, now commonly taken to be P. Livius Larensis, who (if the equation be correct) features in the *Vita Commodi* (and, perhaps, anonymously in Dio) at a dramatic juncture.

Indeed, Athenaeus can come up with some arresting matters in his Roman sequences. For example, there is the claim that Caligula was known as Neos Dionysos, in which role he assumed the god's regalia and handed down judgements of law.[13] That is an aspect of this Julio-Claudian emperor to be found in neither ancient or modern standard accounts.[14] Or consider another unsatisfactory *princeps*, one akin to Caligula; namely Commodus. It is common form in the usual sources to ridicule that ruler's obsession with the image of Hercules. Yet Athenaeus mentions it with approval, in a past tense that precludes any belief in a forced compliment to a living tyrant.[15]

There will be no agreement on how to exploit such items. Caligula as the New Dionysus could have come out of a source. Or was he inspired by Caracalla, who is so styled on an inscription?[16] Athenaeus' view of Commodus may have been an unusually tolerant one; constrained perhaps, the cynic will want to subjoin, by the memory of advancement under that ruler of the banqueters Larensis and Galen – and of the narrator himself? On another view, the tolerant glance at Commodus in the role of Hercules, something defended by reference to Alexander the Great, might again be tied in with Caracalla. For that emperor, notorious for his love of the Alexander image, came to foster comparisons of himself with Hercules, after initial deprecation.[17]

---

10. On this, see F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 143; henceforth referred to by author's name.

11. See B. Baldwin, 'Bi-culturalism and Bi-lingualism in the Roman Empire', *Proceedings of the Pacific North-West Conference on Foreign Languages* 25 (Oregon, 1974), 65.

12. Insufficiently exploited by E. Alföldi-Rosenbaum's papers on luxury and the *HA* in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium* 1970 (1972) – henceforth cited as *BHAC*.

13. 4.148d.

14. Not in Suetonius or Dio; missed (as far as I can see) by J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius* (Oxford, 1934).

15. 12.537f.

16. *CIG* 6829 (= *IGR* 4.468); Millar, 216, assigns it to the period 198–209 (not adducing the Athenaeus passage).

17. *HA*, *Caracalla* 5.5 (rejection), 5.9 (acceptance) – a quick change of tempo, even for the *HA*.

Athenaeus of Naucratis may have been the supreme polymath of his age, a man of unorthodox opinions, or a time-server in the reigns of Severus[18] and/or Caracalla. Whatever the truth (I do not claim to have it), the *Deipnosophistae* is a document of greater utility to the student of Antonine and Severan Rome than is usually realised. Hence (in part) the genesis of this present paper.

So much by way of exordium. Now to the various enquiries. First, the author himself. There are various possible avenues to a chronology for him. Least secure is the roster of guests at the table of Larensis. Especially if we are to suppose verisimilitude of setting. Most of the participants are otherwise unknown. Set aside narrator and host, and we have two illustrious names: Galen and Ulpian. The latter is said by Athenaeus[19] to have expired a few days after the termination of the banquet. If he was the great jurist, that event belongs to the year 228. But Galen died in 199. Thus only in the Elysian fields could this pair have dined together in 228.

It is possible that the deipnosophists are aggregated from different ages.[20] On that reckoning, any investigation of dates and personnel is doomed. Adherence to the belief that such is not the case requires another expedient: rejection of the equation between Ulpian the jurist and the Ulpian of the banquet. That issue is deferred for the moment. One problem at a time. It is already clear that 228 is in no way a safe terminus for any chronology.

According to the brief notice in the *Suda*,[21] derived no doubt from the *Pinax* of Hesychius of Miletus, Athenaeus of Naucratis was a grammarian γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων Μάρκου. It is notoriously difficult to decide whether γεγονώς and γέγονε mean 'born' or 'flourished' in the biographies of the *Suda*.[22] To adduce a most pertinent example, the latter meaning must be applied to the lexicographer's notice of Galen.[23] For the illustrious medical is remarked as γεγονώς in the reigns of Marcus and Commodus and Pertinax: even the greatest doctors only enjoy one birth.

Either way, recourse to the notice of Athenaeus would have saved the Budé editor from an egregious error.[24] He proclaimed that 'Médecin philosophe, Galien de Pergame était mort quand notre Athénée ne pouvait être qu'un enfant'. In cold fact, even if γεγονώς be taken as 'born' and we go to the limits by assuming that Athenaeus came into the world in the final year of Marcus'

18. In view of the controversial deification of Commodus by Severus. This topic will be reverted to later.

19. 15.686c; see later for the new date of 223 for the jurist's death.

20. The notion is floated, but not liked, by Gulick, xiv. To adduce (as he does) Lucian's *dial. Mort*. is not valid: Hades has no chronological restrictions on meetings.

21. A 731 (Adler).

22. See E. Rohde, 'Γέγονε in den Biographica des Suidas', *Rh. Mus.* 33 (1878), 161, 638.

23. G 32 (Adler).

24. Introd., xvi; Kaibel, *Praef.*, vi, did not make this blunder.

reign, that would still make the deipnosophist nineteen years old at Galen's death. An implausibly strapping *enfant* even by Gallic standards!

Given the unreliability of so much of what passes for biography in the *Suda*, it is reasonable – nay, obligatory – to ask what warrant the writer had for connecting Athenaeus with Marcus Aurelius. Might the connection be no more than crude inference from the text of the *Deipnosophistae*?

It seems unlikely. For there is but one allusion to Marcus. It occurs in one of the earliest extracts from the first book,[25] with reference to the sacerdotal appointment of Larensis. That Marcus is described as τοῦ πάντα ἀρίστου βασιλέως proves nothing; Hadrian is accorded the identical accolade, more than once.[26] The most obvious target for inferential connection is in fact Commodus. For, in the aforementioned reference[27] to that emperor's obsession with Hercules, it is stated without equivocation that the *princeps* was καθ' ἡμᾶς.

A moment of relative precision is here possible. From the language of Athenaeus, it is patent that Commodus was dead at the time of writing (or publication). His account is that of an eye-witness: Commodus rode in a chariot with a club beside him and a lion-skin spread as a rug. Both numismatic and literary evidences indicate that the emperor's manic emulations of Hercules broke out in the last stages of his reign, perhaps as late as 191.[28] We may accordingly risk the speculation that Athenaeus was in Rome at that time.

At one stage of the banquet,[29] Larensis looks to a moment in his career when he was appointed as procurator to one of the provinces of Moesia (which one is not specified) by τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοκράτορος. Gulick assumes that the emperor in question is Commodus. Not so Kaibel.[30] And historians such as Dessau, Pflaum, and Birley have been rightly non-committal.[31]

For if Commodus is in question, and the passage is composed and published (as it must surely be) after 192, would anyone allude to the late 'monster' in such respectful terms? This is a problem we have already faced. Larensis had prospered under the Antonines. It may be that he did not join in the *damnatio memoriae* indulged in by the senate after Commodus' death. Athenaeus could be conveying such an impression by his phraseology. Or perhaps the deipnosophist from Naucratis had his own reasons for regretting the last of the

25. 1.1c (a reference omitted from Kaibel's *Index Nominum*).
26. 8.361f; 13.574f.
27. 12.537f.
28. See A. R. Birley, *Septimius Severus* (London, 1971), 133 (this book will henceforth be cited by author's name), and Millar, 133, for the evidence.
29. 9.398e.
30. Who admits only the Hercules reference to his *Index Nominum*.
31. H. Dessau, 'Zu Athenaeus', *Hermes* 25 (1890), 156; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres* (Paris, 1960–1), no. 194 (henceforth cited as *Carrières*), and restating the matter in his *BHAC 1970* paper, 233; Birley, 145.

Antonines. Literary men had been known to do well at Rome in that reign:[32] they did not all go the way of the brothers Quintilii. Or again, the attitude could have been conditioned by the sudden apotheosis of Commodus in Severan Rome.[33]

There is another palpable link between Athenaeus and the era of Marcus Aurelius. An extract from his first book[34] makes mention of a discussion of the philosopher-dancer Memphis. This ought to be the actor Agrippus, imported from Syria by Verus, according to the *Historia Augusta*.[35] The biographer awards him the cognomen of Memphius, before styling him Apolaustus. Manumitted, the thespian took the polyonymous label of L. Aelius Aurelius Apolaustus Memphius, under which impressive style he lived until liquidated by Commodus in 189.[36] For present purposes, the point is that Agrippus Memphius is described as a contemporary ((ἐφ' ἡμῶν) in the pages of Athenaeus. In general terms, the concordance between deipnosophist and biographer should be of interest to those who wrestle with the problems of the *Historia Augusta*.

Let it be noted, *en passant*, that Marcus Aurelius is not referred to as divine. Neither is Commodus, nor the other two emperors mentioned by name in the dialogue: Hadrian and Augustus.[37] Athenaeus prefers to employ other honorifics, as cited in the foregoing pages.

Other allusions in the *Deipnosophistae* carry us back through the Antonine period to that of Hadrian. The *bon vivant* Magnus, in one of his rare intrusions into the learned talk, recalls how he as a young man came to know a certain Aristomenes of Athens.[38] This fellow was versatile indeed. Apart from composing at least three volumes on the subject of ceremonial ware, he was an actor of Old Comedy, and a favoured freedman of Hadrian who dubbed him *Atticoperdix* as a compliment.

Aristomenes of Athens is otherwise unattested.[39] Naturally, we have no dates for him, or for Magnus, if indeed the latter existed. At face value, however, the situation militates against a late Severan date for the *Deipnosophistae*, unless Aristomenes lived to be very old.

---

32. It is sufficient to cite the cases of Adrian of Tyre (Philostratus, *VS*, p. 588) and Pollux (*VS*, p. 593). Observe that Adrian and Ulpian share a birthplace.

33. On this, see *HA*, *Commodus* 17.11 (with Magie's note in the Loeb); cf. Birley, 198. Inscriptions disclose that the procedure began as early as 195. Which would accord with the contention of Dittenberger (*art. cit.*) that the *Deipnosophistae* belongs to the period 193–197.

34. 1.20c.

35. *Verus* 8.10. The fullest account is in M. Kokolakis, *Pantomimus and the Treatise* Περὶ Ὀρχήσεως (Athens, 1959), 7; neither Kokolakis nor Magie seem to be aware of the Athenaeus passage, unlike *PIR*[2] A 148.

36. *HA*, *Comm.* 7.2. His death is assigned to 189 by Magie, to 190 by A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1966), 206.

37. 14.652a (acknowledging Nicolaus of Damascus as the source).

38. 3.115b.

39. *PIR*[2] A 1055; the absence of this item from the *HA* is worth remarking.

Another and more striking link with Hadrian is forged by, of all people, Ulpian. He claims[40] to have known the poet Pancrates, who showed the emperor a rosy lotus flower at Alexandria. It was after Hadrian had killed a great Libyan lion, an event dutifully celebrated in verse by Pancrates. The poet was rewarded with pensioner status in the Museum.

We know a little about Pancrates the poet.[41] The Cynic philosopher who bore that name, associated both with Athens (where he saved the philosopher-administrator Lollianus of Ephesus from a bread riot) and Corinth, will also be thought of here.[42] Again, there is no chronology, and we cannot be sure of how highly Athenaeus valued dramatic realism. But in practical terms, it is not easy to equip Ulpian the jurist with personal memories of a poet from the age of Hadrian.

At this juncture, it is appropriate to assess the references to Hadrian in Athenaeus. There are four passages in which the emperor is named.[43] All redound to his credit. Two (discussed above) commend him for his patronage of the actor-author-freedman Aristomenes and the poet Pancrates; a third praises his revamping of the Parilia as a festival in honour of Rome; the fourth enthuses over his erection of a statue to Alcibiades at Melissa.

It may seem natural that a literary man should rhapsodise over a *princeps* who nurtured men of letters. Could Athenaeus be dropping a hint in some imperial direction? If so, one might be tempted to think of Caracalla, a ruler not famous for patronage of the arts. Yet it is striking how keen the deipnosophist of Naucratis is to present Hadrian in the best light possible. He is, as noted earlier, awarded the same honorific description as Marcus Aurelius, and his devotion to the arts is more than once praised as superlative.[44] There is no trace of the fractious emperor adumbrated by Dio and developed by the *Historia Augusta*.

This is of interest. Unmitigated praise of Hadrian was a rare phenomenon in the age of Athenaeus. Dio Cassius did not shrink from detailing the darker side, and greatly undervalued the utility, political as well as cultural, of the emperor's philhellenism.[45] There would appear to have been sections of pronounced hostility in the biography by Marius Maximus.[46] Casual allusions in such as Fronto underline the situation, balanced as they are by indications

40. 15.677e.
41. *Deip.* 11.478a; Plutarch, *De Mus.* 1137E; *P. Ox.* 73.
42. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 526.
43. 3.115b (omitted from Kaibel's *Index*); 8.361f; 13.574f; 15.677e.
44. μουσικώτατος.
45. On this, see Millar, 71–2.
46. Compare Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968), 91; *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), 126–8 (henceforth cited as *AHA* and *EB*), with Birley, 317–8.

of approval in, for instance, Aulus Gellius.[47] The end-product of all this is the version put forward by the *Historia Augusta*.

Whence the enthusiasm of Athenaeus? Various possibilities offer. A mind of his own is not to be ruled out. Nor is the imbibing of Hadrian's own version of things, issued in the imperial autobiography. It might not have been hard in Severan Rome, especially that of Septimius and Caracalla, for a Greek man of letters to work up some nostalgia for an imperial philhellene. Especially if, as is now believed, the once vaunted 'circle' of Julia Domna (into which our author has been inserted), had little formal existence and no political influence.[48]

None of the deipnosophists could have had any personal debt of gratitude to Hadrian. However, there is one luminary from that earlier age who could have conditioned the attitude of Athenaeus. No sophist stood higher in Hadrian's favour than Polemo of Laodicaea.[49] According to Galen,[50] Polemo coined a notable phrase to describe Rome: she was the 'epitome of the world'. An extract from his first book[51] discloses that Athenaeus reproduced this *mot*.

This proves nothing. A phrase could have been borrowed for mockery as much as emulation. Yet it might suggest that Athenaeus was an admirer, perhaps even a pupil, of Polemo. If so, he might have been acquainted with the ill-fated Hermocrates of Phocaea, the great-grandson of Polemo, who was prospering under Severus before his early death.[52] The captious Philostratus, no doubt purveying the jealousy of rival *salons*, asserts that Hermocrates was the only follower or descendant of Polemo to merit discussion.[53]

Two other items can be adduced here. The character to whom Athenaeus narrates his account of the banquet is a certain Timocrates. That happens to be the name of Polemo's philosophy teacher, defended and admired by his luminous pupil.[54] It could be that Timocrates of Athenaeus is a descendant. Or a fiction, designed to recall that real-life original. Either way, Polemo's mentor suits the learned table, for his first ambition had been medicine: four of the deipnosophists (including Galen) were physicians.

Second, and much more tenuous. A foolish youth of sophistic pretensions who incurred the wrath of Polemo was called Varus.[55] Amongst the assembled

47. Fronto (*Ad Verum* 2.1 = Loeb, 2, 138) scorned his archaising style; Gellius, *NA* 3.16.2; 11.15.3; 13.22.1; 16.4.4. Hadrian is the only emperor named by Gellius (of his own century, that is).

48. For expert demolition work on earlier fantasies, see Bowersock, 101–17. Athenaeus was reckoned a member by M. Platnauer, *The Life and Reign of the Emperor L. Septimius Severus* (Oxford, 1918), 144–5.

49. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 530; Bowersock, *passim*, esp. 48, 120–1.

50. 5,585 Kuhn.

51. 1.19b.

52. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 608.

53. *VS*, p. 544.

54. *VS*, p. 536; cf. Bowersock, 67, 91.

55. *VS*, p. 540.

banqueters, one of the least significant is a grammarian of that name, whose one tiny contribution to the talk is rudely ignored.[56] Coincidence or more?

No certitude can be attained. It is possible that Athenaeus was more of an Antonine than a Severan personage, in terms of birth and connections. But there are alternatives to this belief, as outlined above. Whatever the truth, the image of Hadrian in the *Deipnosophistae* is striking. It remains to be added that one[57] of the occasions on which the banquet is said to have occurred is the Parilia, an old festival whose restructuring by Hadrian is, as we have seen, approvingly described by Athenaeus.

At the other end of the chronological scale is Ulpian. If he is the jurist, then the *Deipnosophistae* (in the form we have it) cannot have been completed before 228, since its final book contains a reference to Ulpian's death.

Or so the scenario used to go. However, a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus published in 1966, pertinent to the Egyptian tenure of M. Aurelius Epagathus (the man responsible for the jurist's death), appears to have shifted the date of Ulpian's expiration back to 223.[58] This renders no assistance to the disentangling of Ulpians, but it would, if correct, bring Athenaeus five years closer to the second century.

The equation of the jurist with the deipnosophist was apparently first proposed by Johannes Schweighauser in the first decade of the nineteenth century.[59] Kaibel accepted it for his Teubner edition, and it is perpetuated in the Budé text. Wentzel exploits it in his Pauly-Wissowa notice of Athenaeus. Gulick, the Loeb editor, changed his mind over the course of his labours. His Introduction leans strongly towards the identification; by the time of his note on the passage concerning Ulpian's death, he has abandoned it for the possibility of the jurist's father.[60]

Ulpian senior is essentially the creation of Dittenberger;[61] as a candidate, he has attracted some modern support, including that of Syme.[62] Other

56. 3.118d–e; see later on Varus.

57. 8,361f. Observe that at 3.99e, the banquet is in the dog-days, whereas it is January by 9.372b; see Gulick, xi.

58. *P. Ox.* 2565, confirming the suggestion of L. Howe, *The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian* (Chicago, 1942), 100. See O. W. Reinmuth, *The Prefects of Egypt 30 BC to 299 AD* (New Haven, 1967), 113; J. Modrejewski and T. Zawadzki, 'La date de la mort d'Ulpien et la préfecture du prétoire au début du règne d'Alexandre Sévère,' *Rev. hist. de droit français et étranger* 45 (1967), 565; Syme, *EB*, 153; Birley, 341–2. Stein in *PIR*² D 169 has *paulo ante 229*.

59. In his Strasburg edition (1801–7), 1, 19. See K. Mengis, *Die schriftstellerische Technik im Sophistenmahl des Athenaios* (Paderborn, 1920), 31–6; W. Kunkel, *Herkunft und soziale Stellung der römischen Juristen* (Weimar, 1952), 245.

60. Introd., viii; it is registered in his index of proper names as a fact. The change of mind appears in vol. 7, 175.

61. *Art. cit.*, 20–3; cf. F. Hackmann, *De Athen. Naucr. Quaest. Select.* (Berlin, 1912), 23.

62. *EB*, 155 n. 5; cf. B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto, 1973), 53.

scholars,[63] writing both before and after the payrus publication, have remained sagely non-committal.

Ulpian the deipnosophist is ushered into the banquet as Ulpian of Tyre (1.1d). His geographical provenance is stressed more than once. Phoenicia is said to be his native land (15.697c); he is once called a Syrian (8.346c), and twice dubbed 'Syratticist' (3.126f; 9.368c).

There is only one hint of a public career for him. On two occasions, Ulpian is addressed by the vocative λογιστά (9.401b; 14.649a). Gulick wondered if this might not indicate that Ulpian was one of the *curatores urbium*,[64] styled in Greek as λογισταί. If so, and if Ulpian is the jurist, we have an item from his career not considered in the usual accounts. The office was an important one, apparently dating from the reign of Trajan. Corresponding to the *curator reipublicae* or *civitatis*, this magistrate supervised the financial administration of a city or a group of communities, sometimes an entire province. The position is attested for the mainland and islands of Greece, Egypt, and many parts of the East, including Syria and Tyre.[65] It would not be unworthy of the *cursus* of Domitius Ulpian.

However, caution is enjoined. The noun may simply be used in its prime sense of 'reasoner' or 'calculator'. Gulick hedged his bets by translating it as 'reasoner' in the first passage, 'bursar' in the second. Its first occurrence is in a phrase which imports poetic jingle: φροντιστὰ καὶ λογιστά. That may be nothing more than an echo of Aristophanes.[66]

Yet if the word be taken as the official title, we have not come away empty-handed, whoever this Ulpian was. For λογιστής in this technical sense is restricted in the lexica to epigraphic sources, with no literary authorities added.[67]

Ulpian is the chief speaker in the dialogue, quite overshadowing the host Larensis and that other distinguished participant, Galen of Pergamum. It is made clear early in the proceedings (2.58b) that he was the symposiarch. Gulick thought that these two honours might have been devised by Athenaeus as a compliment to the high position of the jurist in Rome.

That was not an unreasonable notion. But it will have to be asked why Athenaeus did not take the obvious step and refer to Ulpian's juristic and political career. After all, he is quite explicit about the qualifications of Larensis, Galen, and most of the other wiseacres. One might have suggested

63. E. g., Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 294; Bowersock, 14, n. 4.
64. In his note on 9.401b (*curatores urbium* is his phrase).
65. For details, see the articles of M. N. Tod in *JHS* 25 (1905), 44; *JHS* 42 (1922), 167.
66. *Aves* 318.
67. LSJ give only *IG Rom.* 3.39 (Bithynia); the *Supplement* has no literary reference, nor has H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (Toronto, 1973), s.v. The presence of Philostratus, *VS*, p. 512 in Tod's lists is misleading, since it is the verb λογιστεύω that is found there.

that the Ulpian of the banquet had not yet attained his eminence, thus aiding Dittenberger's efforts to restrict the *Deipnosophistae* to the period 193–197. But that is at once impeded by the reference to Ulpian's death near the end of the dialogue.

An exhaustive and exhausting tabulation of Ulpian's contributions to the table talk would clinch nothing; it is in any case supplied by the indices of Kaibel and Gulick.[68] Athenaeus introduces him as a pedant notorious in the streets, colonnades, bookshops, and baths of Rome for his enquiries into literary precedents for almost any word that comes up in conversation. This is one of his two constant traits, earning him various sobriquets such as Keitoukeitos (1.1e), Syratticist (3.126f; 9.368c), a Daedalus of words (9.396a), word-chaser (4.184b), and hyper-critic (14.613c).

His other proclivity is wrangling with Cynic philosophers. Most of his appearances in the dialogue involve clashes with Cynulcus and Myrtilus of Thessaly, the other leading participants. Ulpian and Cynulcus are billed as always in conflict (6.270c), and particular animosity between pedant and Myrtilus is once alleged (13.571a).

In both regards, Ulpian typifies aspects of the life of Antonine and early Severan intellectuals, as described both by its admirers and detractors. Aulus Gellius[69] has a seminar on philology set in a bookshop; Fronto can pause to ask after literary antecedents for a word whilst simultaneously occupied with the gout and discussion of blueprints with architects;[70] animosities between sophists (notably Herodes Atticus) and Cynics are attested by Gellius, Lucian, and Philostratus.[71] We need not doubt that this atmosphere lasted into the third century.

None of this helps our enquiry into the identity of Ulpian, in any formal way. Yet his activities and tastes conform exactly to those of the second century. In due course, we shall link them more precisely with some evidence from Lucian.[72] The procedure might help the claims of Ulpian the father, and suggest that Athenaeus himself belonged more to the second than the third century.

Ulpian the jurist could have been a querulous pedant. The lawyer and prefect is not incompatible with the grammarian. Yet, apart from the issue of Ulpian's mode of death, there are certain scenes in the *Deipnosophistae* which militate

68. My experience is that Gulick is more reliable than Kaibel. Typical scenes are at: 2.49a; 2.58b; 3.96f; 3.99e; 3.107a; 3.108a; 3.122f; 3.125a; 3.126f; 4.150a; 4.165b; 4.184b; 6.228c; 6.270c; 7.275c; 9.396a; 9.401b; 14.613c. An untypically long silence between 10.459a and 14.613c may partially be explained by the lack of any indicated speakers in Book Twelve (see later on this). It is amusing to see that a bawdy turn in the conversation at 9.367d silences Ulpian.

69. *NA* 18.4.

70. *NA* 19.10.

71. *NA* 9.2 (cp. 1.2 for Herodes in conflict with a Stoic); Lucian, *Peregrinus* 19; Philostratus, *VS*, p. 563.

72. Specifically, the *Lexiphanes* (which might involve Galen).

against the equation. That is, unless we are misled by Athenaeus' sense of humour (on which more will later be said). For this is an element of the narrator which can provoke ambiguity. In one exchange (4.150a), Ulpian is sarcastically hailed as an expert on the 'laws' relating to Naucratite eating habits. Might this not be a joke on the reputation of a great lawyer? The fact that Naucratis is Athenaeus' own city could lend point.

Three scenes are in question, in ascending order of cogency. The first (8.361f) has Ulpian ignorant of what went on at the festival of the Parilia as revised by Hadrian. Is such nescience likely on the jurist's part?

More notable is the moment (3,115b) when Ulpian has to ask after the Greek equivalent for *libertus*. Surely Ulpian the lawyer could have delivered himself of a weighty lecture on that topic? It may be significant that Athenaeus chooses to abort this discussion within a couple of sentences or so.

Most telling is the clash (3.121f) between Ulpian and Cynulcus over the use of Latin. The latter's request for *decocta* sends Ulpian into a passion against the use of so barbarous a tongue in 'civilised' circles. It is the Cynic who is granted the commonsense defence of speaking in Rome as the Romans do. It is not easy to credit that Ulpian the jurist, himself a user of Latin and high in Roman councils, could have come out with such an outburst.

The information[73] we have about the career of Domitius Ulpianus permits no easy correlation with the deipnosophist. The only discernible common ground is geographical origin. A passage in the *Digest*[74] from the jurist's own pen makes proud (or defiant?) allusion to his provenance: *ut est in Syria Phoenice splendidissima Tyriorum colonia, unde mihi origo est, nobilis regionibus, serie saeculorum antiquissima, armipotens*. . . . The frequent twitting of Ulpian the grammarian for his native land by his opponents might suggest that they were weary of hearing it exalted by the scholar. But this is no ground on which to erect foundations of belief in anything: Syrian jokes were hardly uncommon. A rider might be added here. References to Syria will have been carefully tailored during the reign of Elagabalus.

Ulpian the lawyer is frequently mentioned in the *Historia Augusta*. Most of the passages concern his political influence and juristic skills. There is very little to indicate a sophist or scholar outside the legal field. The volumes dedicated by Ulpian to the consular Sabinus are not in any way described;[75] they could simply have been legal treatises or the like. Even if he did once hold the office of *a libellis* in the Severan period, a claim now usually disbelieved on

73. For *testimonia* (incomplete) and brief discussion, see Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 294, and *Le Marbre de Thorigny* (Paris, 1948), 41; Howe, *op. cit.*, 75; Kunkel, *op. cit.*, 245; A. Stein in *Eunomia* 1 (1957), 1; Syme, *EB*, 147–51, 154, 156–7; Millar, 170; Birley, 341.

74. 50.15.1.

75. *Elag.* 16.2; this passage is discussed later.

76. *Pesc.* 7.4 (disbelieved by, e.g., Pflaum, Syme, and Birley).

account of the unreliability of the *Vita Pescennii*,[76] that would not guarantee particular literary interests.

One passage alone might be taken to support the equation of Ulpian. It is one of nine[77] references to the lawyer in the life of Severus Alexander: *cum inter suos convivaretur, aut Ulpianum aut doctos homines adhibebat, ut haberet fabulas litteratas, quibus se recreari dicebat et pasci* (34.6). At first blush, this suggests the deipnosophist. But a man might be invited on the strength of his legal expertise. Athenaeus himself is on hand to support this, for he took care to include the jurist Masurius amongst the register of guests. By the same token, to cover all possibilities, both Masurius and Larensis had skills other than legal ones. The former, for instance, was also a poet. Ulpian is still not ruled out. However, on general principles, if it is safe to entertain any in the case of the *Historia Augusta*, one would have expected at least one overt mention of scholarly activity on the part of Domitius Ulpian, given the biographer's usual zeal for registering orators and academics.

Ulpian the deipnosophist had a sudden and happy death: ἀπέθανεν ἐυτυχῶς, ὀυδένα καιρὸν νόσῳ παραδούς (15.686c). Domitius Ulpian, according to Dio,[78] was lynched by the praetorians. In a later age, the version of Dio was reproduced by Zosimus.[79] Ulpian was one of many important topics deemed worthy of exclusion from his narratives by Herodian. This is more than usually striking, in view of their common Syrian origins. The *Historia Augusta*, as Syme[80] rightly stresses, does not award the jurist a violent end.

There seems no warrant for disbelieving Dio Cassius. Is any reconciliation between a lynching and a happy death possible? Kaibel essayed a desperate expedient, urging a curious principle: *gladio enim peti poterat imperatoris consiliarius, non poterat grammaticus.*[81] Gulick, for a time concurred;[82] 'His assassination is passed over in silence; the violent death of a politician did not comport well with the peaceful death of a plodding scholar'. Neither Kaibel nor Gulick understood the close involvement of many a scholar with the world of politics: they should have remembered the biographies of Philostratus. And these commentators betray no knowledge of the fact that Ulpian himself had procured the deaths of his predecessors in office to further his own ambition![83]

There is one other possibility whereby the equation of Ulpians might be retained and the accounts of Dio and Athenaeus be made to square. The

77. 15.6; 26.5; 26.6; 27.2; 34.6; 51.4; 67.2; 68.1.
78. 80.2.2.
79. *Hist. Nov.* 1.11.1–2.
80. *EB*, 153. Indeed, *Alex. Sev.* 51.4 leaves Ulpian protected by the emperor against the soldiery. Is this one of the biographer's pranks?
81. *Praef.*, vii.
82. See n. 60 above for references.
83. Dio 80.2.2.

latter's Ulpian died suddenly. That is in accord with Dio's lynching. The assertion that it was a happy end might be another example of Athenaeus' sense of humour. For the final tribute to the pedantic Ulpian of Tyre has rightly occasioned surprise amongst readers and editors, discrepant as it is from the treatment of him throughout the dialogue. Athenaeus did not equip Ulpian with any adherents in the *Deipnosophistae*, despite the claim that there was a coterie of Ulpianaean sophists in circulation (3.98c). He is depicted as largely friendless and alone – until his expiration.

Such a scenario is possible, but is probably to be dismissed as too subtle. Let the identification be rejected, then, and other solutions canvassed. One easy way out would be to assume that Ulpian of Tyre is a fiction, as has been claimed for many of the wiseacres. Tempting, but not very satisfying. Another is to accept the deipnosophist as a real person, but without connection with Domitius Ulpian. After all, there are other literary Ulpians, of later or unspecified periods, registered in the *Suda* – and coming from Syria, at that.[84]

However, the most popular alternative is Ulpian senior, father of the jurist. It has the obvious attraction of explaining the common Tyrian background. Another advantage offers. A father would be firmly placed in the second century where, as we have seen, the deipnosophist seems to belong. He would be coeval with Larensis, Galen, and perhaps Athenaeus himself.

In supplement to earlier observations on the suitability of a second century *milieu* is the promised evidence from Lucian. It is extracted from one of that fellow-Syrian's most elaborate assaults upon linguistic excess, the *Lexiphanes*.

The philological villain of this piece drones out an interminable extract from his new work, a *Symposium* à la Plato. It is replete with Atticisms, genuine and fake, and curious words. Lexiphanes is finally taken in hand by Lucian and a doctor called Sopolis, made to vomit up his vile vocabulary, and taught the virtues of plain, clear style.

First, two ancillary points. There was more than one reason why Lucian gave Lexiphanes a *Symposium*. That setting is perfectly contrived for displaying the requisite oddities of diction.[85] And a banquet scene is the most familiar motif. Yet it may reflect upon literary soirées from real life. The dinner table is the scene for learned pontification in the *Noctes Atticae*.[86] Lucian's *Convivium* may have been partly intended as a spoof of this sort of thing. So might the

84. 0 911 (sophist from Emesa), 912 (Antiochus Ulpianus of Emesa, in Constantine's reign), 913 (Ulpian of Gaza), 914 (brother of Isidore the philosopher). In other fields there were other Ulpians, such as Ti. Claudius Zeno Ulpianus of the Severan period (Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 228), albeit from nowhere near Tyre.

85. Calvisius Taurus makes this very point in forcible manner to Gellius and company (*NA* 1.9.8–10), when discoursing on the popularity of Plato with students who wanted instant expertise in philosophy and rhetoric: *est qui Platonem legere postulet, non vitae ornandae, sed linguae orationisque comendae gratia, nec ut modestior fiat, sed ut lepidior.*

86. E.g., 7.13; 19.9.

Deipnosophistae, which takes neither the participants nor their erudition too seriously.

Second, there is a sporting chance (no more) that the Sopolis of Lucian's dialogue was meant to represent Galen.[87] Even if false, the notion allows a pertinent word here about the great doctor. His Lucianic views and prolific publications on Attic style and Atticist controversies are known from his own bibliographies. His role in these battles was no unique one. Phrynichus of Bithynia is often scornful of the diction of medicals in his *Praeparatio Sophistica*; De Borries was probably right to suggest that the purists had a *nota cum medicis de sermone contentio*.[88]

Athenaeus exploited this situation. Ulpian is himself credited with wry approval of the *mot*, issued by an unnamed deipnosophist, that 'were it not for doctors, there would be nothing stupider than grammarians' (15.666a). And there are no fewer than four physicians at the table. But it is wrong to describe him, as does Bowersock,[89] as a leading participant, for Galen in fact has an oddly muted role. Though introduced with honour and clarity (1.1e), he is allowed only two small contributions, both dealing with diet and health (1.26c; 5.115c).

Why this neglect, we cannot say. Some clash involving personalities and/or rival coteries would be a fair conjecture but no more. What is again to the purpose is the closeness of Athenaeus' banquet to the Antonine scene.

Now the promised precision of detail. At least nine of the locutions of Lexiphanes are ridiculed by Cynulcus as typical of Pompeianus of Philadelphia, Ulpian himself, and the Ulpianean sophists at large. Full lexical data are assembled elsewhere.[90] Coincidence seems to be excluded. Thus, unless we can believe that the same words had a lifespan of almost half a century within one group of *littérateurs*, the animadversions of Lucian and Athenaeus should be regarded as convergent upon the same target. Lexiphanes represents an Ulpianean sophist, whether he be the leader himself, or Pompeianus, or the group in general.[91]

There is little firm chronology for the multifarious productions of Lucian. But it is enough for the present purpose to know his basic period. The identification of Lexiphanes proposed above would suit the chronology of Ulpian the father to perfection.

It might be asked why Athenaeus included no mention of his famous son, in that case. One would respond by simple reminder of the incomplete state of the *Deipnosophistae*, which disallows certitude on either side. An auxiliary

87. Baldwin, *op. cit.*, 36–40.
88. Teubner edition, *Praef.*, xxvi.
89. Bowersock, 64.
90. Baldwin, 50–3; A. H. Harmon, Loeb edition, 5, 291 f.
91. Harmon was tempted by this equation, first proposed by E. E. Seiler in the last century.

counter is to plead on behalf of Dittenberger's restriction of Athenaeus' dialogue to the years 193–197.

No more on Ulpians. We have reached, perhaps passed, the point of diminishing returns. But there are still things to be said concerning the chronology and career of Athenaeus himself.

One obviously firm link with the second century is Galen, dead in 199. Another would appear to be the host of the verbose diners. To say this does not require the old notion of Rudolph, wrongly perpetuated by Wright in the Loeb of Philostratus' *Lives*, that Larensis is a cover-name for Herodes Atticus.[92] Mine host would seem to have been a real character, with an Antonine career.

He is now universally regarded as P. Livius Larensis, a *pontifex minor* commemorated as *marito incomparabili* by his wife Cornelia Quinta on an inscription.[93] It was Dessau,[94] impressed by the congruence of so uncommon a name and the fact that Athenaeus introduces his host as a priest, who established the identification.[95]

Other things accrue. According to Athenaeus, Larensis was in authority over one of the provinces of Moesia (9.398e). Pflaum[96] fitted him in around 189 as a procurator. The *Historia Augusta* imports a Livius Laurensis in a dramatic role. As *procurator patrimonii* in 192, it was he who obeyed Pertinax and gave up the body of Commodus to Fabius Cilo for burial.[97] There are those who believe (and those who do not) that he was the anonymous 'most trusted comrade' of Pertinax, whom Dio records as dispatched by the latter to view the imperial cadaver.[98]

Students of the *Historia Augusta* will find it notable that the biographer could pick up so rare a name and affix it to a plausible context without the aid of Dio. Happily, we do not need to ponder over Marius Maximus, *Ignotus*, and other claimants, for present purposes.

More to the immediate point, if Laurensis were Dio's unnamed character, it would not be hard to believe that his career (and life) came to an abrupt halt in the period 193–197. The most trusted comrade of Pertinax is not likely to have prospered after his master's fall. Unless, that is, he was an adept at changing sides or deep and discreet retirement from Rome. These considerations may

92. Introd., xxxiv.
93. *CIL* 6.2126 (cf. 32401) = *ILS* 2932; the provenance is Rome.
94. *Art. cit.*
95. Dessau could find only C. Granius Larensis (*CIL* 8.7973). The identification is accepted by: *PIR*² L 297; Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 194 (and *BHAC 1970*, 233); Birley, 146; Bowersock, 20, no. 4, 64.
96. *Carrières*, p. 1068 (followed by *PIR*²).
97. *Comm.* 20.1.
98. Dio 73.1.2. This particular equation was proposed by E. Hohl, 'Kaiser Pertinax und. die Thronbesteigung seines Nachfolgers im Lichte der Herodiankritik', *SDAW* (1956), 6 It was accepted as possible by *PIR*², but viewed with suspicion by Millar, 134 n. 6.

also assist efforts to restrict Athenaeus' dialogue to the last decade of the second century.

Larensios (as Athenaeus styles him) is ushered in with copious detail, and nicely characterised throughout. He was notable for wealth, and wealth of learning. Such was his bilingual expertise that the nickname of Asteropaeus was fastened upon him. Diligent and unaided research had made him expert in both antique Roman rituals (all the way back to Romulus!) and political science. It is no surprise that he had the largest library in Rome; what does cause some shock is that it was restricted to Greek works (1.3a).

His contributions to the conversation are designed to suit the above characteristics. The chief manifestation of his hellenism was a craze for Homer (14.620b); an ability to hold his own in a discussion of riddles (10.448c) testifies to his scholarship and wits. No uncritical philhellene, he twice reaches back into the late Republic for anecdotes (involving Marius and Lucullus) to the credit of Romans (2.51a; 5.221f). The issuing of an encomium on married women (13.555c) may be thought to fit a Roman host, and his closing of the entire proceedings with incense, libation, and a paean to Hygieia (a nice touch that, after so long a feast of food and words) suits the *pontifex*.

On two occasions, he is given strange statements. The assertion that few Roman grammarians were conversant with Greek poetry and history (4.160b) is arrant nonsense. In reverse, the dogma might have held. Is Athenaeus poking fun again? Of equal implausibility is the claim (6.272e) that households of ten to twenty thousand slaves were common in Rome. Had that been said to one of the Hellenes present, we might set it aside as a piece of chauvinistic boasting. But the remark is in fact made to the polymath Masurius, who is both jurist and Roman.

Larensis is permitted two reflections upon his own career and background. There is the allusion to his sojourn in Moesia, already inspected. In addition, he refers to the great Varro as the Menippean who is ὁ ἐμὸς προπάτωρ. Is this intended as indicative of a personal connection, or merely a generalising ethnic one?[99]

None of this helps to establish the equation. Two points may demonstrate that it is not so certain as is nowadays maintained. First, the sacerdotal appointment. The host was appointed by Marcus Aurelius to be in charge of both Greek and Roman rites, supervising both temples and sacrifices. This vague and prestigious office, redolent of the old *rex sacrorum* of the Republican age, might appear too much for a *pontifex minor*. However, the extract stresses (1.2b) that Athenaeus was here eulogising Larensis, which permits us to make some discount for rhetorical hyperbole.

Second, the inscription makes mention only of Larensis' pontificate. Being

99. *Deip.* 4.160b (in the context of the Roman grammarians, discussed above). Recollection of Varro as the Menippean suits the second century, when one thinks of Lucian; cf. Marcus Aurelius, *Medit.* 6.47.

epitaphic, it cannot be said to have pre-dated the Moesian appointment and the *procurator patrimonii* status. This very restricted laudation tends not to be discussed. Yet it may get us into another tangle of father or son questions, as with Ulpian.

Which is not fatal, except to dogmatic sentences in some modern works. The host of Athenaeus' banquet undeniably pertains to the second century. All the more so, if he is the Laurensis of the *Historia Augusta*. And perhaps absolutely, as argued above, were he Pertinax' most loyal comrade. We are still firmly within the confines of the Antonine and early Severan periods.

This may be the season to insert a bold speculation concerning Athenaeus and the setting of his dialogue. The *savants* are assembled at the house of Larensis, in Rome. Excluding the host, the narrator, and Timocrates (to whom Athenaeus relates his material), there are twenty-one named participants, supported by a host of anonymous and briefly intrusive extras.[100]

Such a throng of guests is in violation of the 'rules' laid down in Varro's Menippean work entitled *Nescis quid Vesper serus vehat*, excerpted for us by Aulus Gellius.[101] It is prescribed that three is the smallest number allowable, nine the greatest. In a later age, Ausonius regarded more than seven as a *convicium* rather than a *convivium*.[102]

Nicely enough, the number of guests at Lucian's satiric *Convivium* almost conformed to Varro's dictates; yet a fierce *convicium* was to result.[103] Athenaeus was acquainted with the Menippean productions of Varro, as we have seen. It could be that his large number of guests is a deliberate mockery. Further scrutiny of Gellius' extrapolations reinforces the view. It is sensibly held that guests should be neither loquacious nor taciturn. No one could accuse Ulpian or Cynulcus of the latter vice, whereas a fair number of the deipnosophists say little about anything. The banquet of Athenaeus may again be regarded as permeated with a studied humour in terms of its structure.

One more thing. Gellius concludes his notice with a brief discussion of the word *bellaria*, employed by Varro for the Greek πέμματα to describe the requisite sweetmeats for dessert. A discussion of πέμματα is inserted into his dialogue by Athenaeus, and awarded to Aemilianus Maurus as one of his contributions to the talk.[104]

Homage to Varro was rife in the second century. Whether or not Athenaeus read the *Noctes Atticae* is unknowable. There is a case, then, for regarding the construction of his *Deipnosophistae* as parodic.

However, the matter does not stop here. The *Historia Augusta*[105] asserts

100. See Kaibel's index to the *Dialogi Personae*, for the contributions of each participant.
101. *NA* 13.11.
102. In the *locus invitationis* section of his *Totius Diei Negotium* (= Loeb, 1, 22).
103. *Conv.* 6–9 for the list of guests and their placings.
104. *Deip.* 4.152d.
105. *Verus* 5.1.

that Verus created a great scandal by giving a banquet with couches for twelve, an allegedly unparalleled affair. It is subjoined that this violated the *notissimum dictum* which held *septem convivium, novem vero convicium.*

It happens that this *notissimum dictum* is known only to the biographer.[106] Advocates of a late fourth-century date for the *Historia Augusta* might see it as inspired by the conceit of Ausonius, cited above. There is also the suspicion that Verus' banquet owes something to a notorious party put on by Augustus, to which the guests came tricked out as the Olympians.[107] For all this, it remains possible that larger banquets either came or came back into fashion in the Antonine period, and that the welter of deipnosophists is a social as well as a literary reflection. In sober truth, nothing is hereby proved concerning Athenaeus. Yet the coincidences (if such they be) are numerous. We have at least re-emphasised that investigators of the *Historia Augusta* must be as alive to Athenaeus, Gellius, and company as to lost or presumed sources.

Athenaeus derived from Naucratis. No unique origin, that. Several sophists emerged from that relatively obscure town, by pleasant and surprising contrast with the great city of Alexandria, which imported a few luminaries to membership in the Museum, but which exported few sophistic sons of its own.

Apart from the early and obscure Theomnestus,[108] four luminaries are registered from Naucratis by Philostratus. Athenaeus is not among them – which (remembering other omissions from the Philostratean gallery) proves nothing. Leading the quartet, for the very good reason that he was one of Philostratus' teachers, comes Proclus.[109] The others consist of the learned Pollux, the lecherous and conspiracy-loving Apollonius, and Ptolemy the globe-trotter.[110]

'Almost nothing is revealed of Naucratis under the empire, but it is hard to believe that purely by accident can we single out so many distinguished sophists from that place in virtually the same generation.' Thus Bowersock,[111] and rightly; his neglect of the earlier Theomnestus hardly spoils the observation. Athenaeus, in terms of provenance, was no isolated phenomenon.

Just as Lucian had to leave humdrum Samosata, so the sons of Naucratis departed their native town to seek fame and fortune. According to Philostratus,[112] Naucratis was prone to violent factional strife. He got this information from Proclus, who gave it as his reason for sailing away to the relative tranquillity of Athens. Yet Proclus may have exaggerated this in order to

106. See Magie, *ad locum.*
107. Suetonius, *DA* 70–1. The outcry of the populace at this is balanced by Marcus Aurelius' bewailing of Verus' effort (*Verus* 5.6).
108. *VS*, p. 486. Wright (in the Loeb) suggested an equation with the Academician who taught in Athens (Plutarch, *Brutus* 24).
109. *VS*, p. 603.
110. *VS*, p. 593 (Pollux), p. 599 (Apollonius), p. 596 (Ptolemy).
111. Bowersock, 20.
112. *VS*, p. 603.

explain away his own lack of *éclat* at home. For the men of Naucratis were judges of discrimination, rarely disposed to granting the honour of dining at public expense in the town's temple. One man so honoured was the sophist Ptolemy, who came home from his world travels to die in Egypt.[113]

Athenaeus beats no drum on behalf of his native town. References to it are (apart from claiming Aristophanes the comic poet as a product) exclusively concerned with food and other appurtenances of the table (373a; 4.149d; 6.229e; 7.301b;11.480d; 15.671e; 15.676a). One would like to detect sly humour in the remaining allusion: Naucratis was famed for its many illustrious harlots (13.596b). That makes a happy (dare we say it?) coupling with Naucratis the producer of intellectuals.

Naucratites did not fare badly abroad. Commodus was sufficiently charmed by Pollux to award him the chair at Athens; Ptolemy was liked and respected wherever he went; Apollonius had to play second fiddle to Heracleides at Athens, but he died to the grief of all Athenians – admittedly a suspect claim;[114] Proclus settled down to a life of comfortable philanthropy and academical ease in Athens. Yet we may note two things. Only Pollux gained the ear and favour of an emperor. And Philostratus' accounts of sophists from Naucratis are less enthusiastic over success than concerned to point up the darker side of things. Even his master Proclus is taken to task for joining in with his son's dissipations, and for allowing himself to be gulled as a 'sugar-daddy' in thrall to a young mistress.[115] Could it be that a certain feeling had developed against this quasi-Mafia of Naucratite sophists?

Athenaeus opted for Rome. As we have seen, his banquet is laid in Rome, has a Roman host, and a blend of Roman and Hellenic participants. We know nothing of a career, sophistic or otherwise. It is a fair inference that he was comfortably off and admissible to polite company. Any sophistic career he might have had was over and suppressed by the time he came to produce the *Deipnosophistae*. For his remarks on sophists and their trade are uniformly vicious (1.4a; 1.22d; 3.98a; 11.505b; 13.565d; 14.621f; 14.632c); it is the tone of Lucian, not Philostratus.

The attitude of a failure? We cannot tell. It is permissible to see his hostility as further evidence of the satirical construction of the *Deipnosophistae*, earlier discussed. Which might be one reason why he was congenial to rich Romans. His defence of Latin, his frequent admission of Latin topics (1.14f; 2.56a; 2.70e; 3.80f; 3.85c; 3.85e; 3.97d; 3.98c; 3.111c; 3.113d; 3.114e; 3.121e; 3.125f; 4.139a; 4.170e; 4.171a; 4.174d; 7.294f; 7.306d; 7.310e; 7.330b; 9.398b; 10.440e; 14.647e; 15.701b), his constant allusions to Roman tastes of the time

113. *VS*, p. 593 (honour, p. 596 [death in Egypt])'

114. *VS*, p. 600: Apollonius had purchased good-will by sharing his wealth and by remitting lecture fees. Unlikely characters tend to die lamented by the Athenians in Philostratus – notably Herodes (*VS*, p. 565).

115. *VS*, p. 604.

in food, drink, and music (2.56a; 3.75e; 3.82c; 4.183e; 6.224c; 7.294e; 9.384c; 14.654d), all of these lead to the same end. He may, of course, have tailored his opinions to suit his patrons – as Lucian did, as many satirists of all ages have done.

Athenaeus depicts a luxurious society. An unsurprising discovery, and not one that can be used to pinpoint his chronology with any precision. Superficially, his picture might be taken to suit the reigns of Commodus or Elagabalus best, within the possible limits for the deipnosophist's lifetime. But such reasoning would be jejune. There is no simple correlation between rulers and ruled, in terms of *mores*. True, according to Tacitus,[116] gourmandising went out of fashion under the Flavians. Many must here have taken their cue from Vespasian. But not everyone turned in their chefs for Stoic philosophers under Marcus Aurelius. The allusions in Athenaeus have no temporal precision.

The *Deipnosophistae* was not his only confection. There was a monograph on the *Thrattae* of Archippus (7.329c). It is clear that this was a scholarly discussion of the content and diction of the piece. One will recall the labours of Galen on Old Comedy.[117] Of greater interest is a treatise on Syrian Kings (5.211a). It is tempting to relate this to either Ulpian of Tyre or the provenance of Elagabalus. But dangerous. Monarchs, Syrian or otherwise, regularly had their biographers or historians. Suetonius composed a *De Regibus*, not restricted in scope to the seven kings of Rome.

It might quickly be subjoined that scholarly work upon Greek Comedy and oriental despots does not make Athenaeus an unalloyed professor or academic recluse. There was not, mercifully, that kind of dichotomy between letters and life in the ancient world, and especially not in the Antonine and Severan eras.

The foregoing pages have laid frequent claim to the satiric nature of Athenaeus' dialogue. To what has been said, there can accrue some final and exact observations. The very title of the work is almost certainly a comic coinage. A long time later, a quotation from Dionysius Chalcus brings the entire proceedings to what Gulick[118] well calls 'a lame and impotent conclusion'.

Between title and finale, there are many indications of the comic spirit. The dialogue is ushered in on a note of parody of Plato's *Phaedo* (1.2a). Ulpian's discoursing is once branded (by narrator, not Cynic rival) as interminable (6.262b), and the company's seminar on fish is laughed at as idle gabble (7.330c). And it is the regular practice of Athenaeus to advise his 'freed' Timocrates that the talk is impossibly prolix and monstrously trivial. These animadversions are placed at the beginnings and ends of individual books,

116. *Ann.* 3.55.
117. Attested by his own bibliographies.
118. Loeb, 7, 275.

where no reader can miss them (1.4c; 3.127d; 4.185a; 5.185b; 6.222b; 6.275b; 7.330c; 8.331b; 8.365e; 9.336a; 11.509e; 12.510a; 15.665a).

If accepted, this view of Athenaeus would afford no secure dating. One inevitably thinks of Lucian, of course. Moreover, since possible connections between Athenaeus and Polemo have already been explored, this is the moment to recollect that the latter was on record as regarding the memorising of authorities and quotations (the stock-in-trade of the deipnosophists) as the most tedious of all pursuits.[119] Galen was another who was bored by cultural affectations and absurdities: is this why he was so silent at Larensis' table?

In brief conclusion. No precision is possible on the matter of Athenaeus' chronology. The old *terminus ante quem non* of 228 has no validity; the date has now to be moved back to 223, still leaving an implausible equation between Ulpian the jurist and Upian the pedant. The internal evidences often seem to point to the second century rather than the third; Dittenberger's confines of 193–197 deserve serious consideration.

Athenaeus emerges as far more than a prolix antiquarian. His details, themes, and characters often pertain to his contemporary Rome, and merit collocation with the writings of Galen, Lucian, and Philostratus. The author exhibits a healthy recognition of Roman achievement in cultural matters and of the importance of the Latin language. His attitude towards antiquarianism and the sectarian issues turns out to be refreshingly light-hearted.

From time to time, the dialogues of Athenaeus serve to complement the biographies of Philostratus, enhance the narratives of Cassius Dio, and perhaps illumine items of fact or nomenclature in the *Historia Augusta*. One cheerfully acknowledges that many will continue to leaf through the *Deipnosophistae* only as a farrago of sources and sauces. But it is also a document for the student of imperial Rome, above all for those engaged in the analysis of the Second Sophistic in the Rome of the Antonines and Severans.

119. *VS*, p. 541.

LXV

THE MINOR CHARACTERS IN ATHENAEUS

Kaibel[1] maintained that most of the Deipnosophists were fictions, derived or compounded from great names of the past. It is a view that has exerted two kinds of influence, both unfortunate. The Budé editor[2] reproduces Kaibel's notions with servility. Gulick of the Loeb[3] rightly contested a number of Kaibels fantasies, but succumbed to a complexity of his own devising: Athenaeus' practice was "to take a well-known personage and attribute to him different traits from those he was known to possess." That credo has a perverse charm, but will get us nowhere slowly. In fact, at least some of the assembled wiseacres are vulnerable to prosopographical scrutiny.

Undue optimism is not in order. In that we are dealing with characters obscure (to us) and otherwise (at first sight) unknown, the harvest is not likely to be a rich one. One will have to be content with some general possibilities, the prospect of linking Athenaeus' guests with names in other sources (including the *Historia Augusta*), and the infracting of Kaibel's dismissal of the lesser *savants* as prosaic fictions.

Major luminaries are excluded from the present investigation. Elswhere,[4] I argue at some length for the old notion of Dittenberger that the Ulpian of Athenaeus' dialogue is the father of the celebrated jurist.[5] The host of the verbose diners bears the uncommon name of Larensis; we do not require the idea of Rudolph, wrongly perpetuated by Wright in her Loeb[6] edition of Philostratus' Lives, that he is a cover-name for Herodes Atticus. Mine host was the *pontifex* P. Livius Larensis, a real character with an Antonine career.[7] Athenaeus himself is treated in detail elsewhere; and Galen is too familiar to require enquiry here.

---

1. Proclaiming thus (Teubner edition, *praef.* vi): *multos omnigena doctrina instructos convivas introduxit sermonocinantes, quorum et nomina et ingenia finxit ad similitudinem clarorum quorundam qui olim fuerunt vivorum, sive grammaticorum sive philosophorum sive medicorum.*
2. A. M. Desrousseaux, introd., xii–xix.
3. Introd., xi–xii.
4. In a paper "Athenaeus and his Work" *Acta Classica* 19 (1976), pp. 21–42.
5. W. Dittenberger, "Athenaeus und sein Werk," *Apophoreton* (1903), 1; the contention is supported by, e.g., R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), 155, n. 5.
6. Introd., xxxiv.
7. The identification was proposed by Dessau, "Zu Athenaeus," *Hermes* 25 (1890), 156; it is supported by: *PIR*^{2} L 297; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain* (Paris, 1960–1), no. 194 (cf. his restatement in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1970* (1972), 233; A. R. Birley, *Septimius Severus* (London, 1971), 146; G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), 20, n. 4; 64.

The character to whom Athenaeus narrates[8] his account of the banquet is a certain Timocrates. This "feed" may be of interest. For Timocrates happens to be the name of the philosophy teacher of the sophist Polemo of Laodicaea, defended and admired by his luminous pupil.[9] Athenaeus displays a certain interest in Polemo. According to Galen,[10] Polemo coined a notable phrase to describe Rome: she was "the epitome of the world." An extract from his first book[11] discloses that Athenaeus reproduced this *mot*.

Which proves nothing. A phrase could have been borrowed for mockery as much as emulation. Yet it might suggest that Athenaeus was an admirer, perhaps even a pupil, of Polemo. If so, the Timocrates of Athenaeus could be a descendant of Polemo's mentor. Or a fiction designed to recall that real-life original. Either way, Polemo's teacher suits the learned table, for his first ambition had been medicine: four of the deipnosophists (including Galen) were physicians.

A second item is worth adducing. A foolish youth of sophistic pretensions who incurred the wrath of Polemo was called Varus.[12] Amongst the assembled banqueters, one of the least significant is a grammarian of that name, whose one tiny contribution to the talk is rudely ignored.[13] Coincidence or more?

Sectarian rivalries could be surfacing. Athenaeus might have been acquainted with the ill-fated Hermocrates of Phocaea, the great-grandson of Polemo, who was prospering under Severus before his untimely death.[14] The captious Philostratus, no doubt purveying the jealousy of rival *salons*, asserts that Hermocrates was the only follower or descendant of Polemo to merit discussion.[15]

Excluding Athenaeus, Timocrates, Larensis, Ulpian, Galen, and the anonymous extras, the guest list is made up of: 8 grammarians (subsuming Palamedes the lexicographer and Myrtilus of Thessaly, albeit the latter tends to operate as a Cynic foil to Cynulcus); 3 doctors; 4 philosophers; 2 musicians; 1 jurist; 1 *bon vivant*.

It is a typical blend. The term "sophist" was a flexible one (Lucian[16] applied it to Christ), incorporating most or all of the learned professions. Surprise was evinced in a most expert quarter[17] at the presence of musicians. No need for

---

8. With much comment on the absurd prolixity and triviality of the talk; these animadversions are placed at the beginnings and ends of individual books, where no reader could miss them: 1.4c; 3.127d; 4.185a; 5.185b; 6.222b; 7.330c; 8.331b; 8.365c; 9.366a; 11.509e; 12.510a; 15.665a.
9. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 536; cf. Bowersock, o.c., 67, 91.
10. 5.584 (Kuhn).
11. 1.19b.
12. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 540.
13. 3.118d–e; see later for Varus.
14. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 608.
15. *VS*, p. 554.
16. *Peregrinus* 13.
17. Bowersock, 14. He is misleading in talking of the presence of a musician; there were two, and it is pertinent that Aemilianus Maurus is described as a music-lover (14.634c).

concern; Athenaeus[18] describes the Antonine mime, Agrippus Memphius, as a "philosopher-dancer." What was allowed to him will certainly have been conceded to the more decorous pair of musicians in the *Deipnosophistae*.

For all that, the labels can mislead. The appellation "philosopher," bestowed by Philostratus upon Julia Domna, was but a courtesy title. And one that was in large measure responsible for the puffing up of her occasional *séances* with men of letters into a regular circle. By the same token, these honorifics can be a boon to speculation. When a philosopher, say, in Athenaeus' dialogue is under scrutiny, the search after clues for his identity does not have to be restricted to philosophical contexts or personnel.

Now to the guests. The order of their appearance here is of no consequence. Hence, as a possible convenience for those who may wish to follow them by means of the indices of Kaibel and Gulick, simple alphabetic sequence is adopted.

1. Aemilianus Maurus. He is introduced along with Plutarch, Leonides of Elis, and Zoilus (1.1c); the quartet is hailed as comprising the most elegant of grammarians. Elsewhere (14.634c), he is billed as a music lover. An angry cook once sneers at his tiny body (9.406a), something that does not have to be taken literally.

His several contributions to the talk have usually to do with mageiric matters: puddings (3.126b–f; 3.127a–d), cooking utensils (4.169a–4.174a; 6.228e–6.231b), Thessalian delicacies (14.662f–14.664f), and general culinary items (9.405d; 9.406a). Two changes of pace are provided by lecturettes on musical instruments (14.634c–e) and riddles (10.448b).

Only once does he really function as a grammarian. That is when he breaks out on the etymology of words for fruit (3.83b). Aemilianus here adduces the authority of Juba of Mauretania, appealing to the latter's history of Libya. A signal reference, from the mouth of a scholar called Maurus. One of Athenaeus' pranks? Or a clue to something?

Kaibel averred that our grammarian was created out of Scipio Africanus Aemilianus, leaving it at that. True, his theory of fictions cannot be disproved. But we are entitled to travel down other roads, so long as it is understood that many of them may turn out to be *culs-de-sac*.

Aemilianus is a name borne by imperial men of letters. The elder Seneca attests to a *rhetor Graecus* of his own time; he was very likely the father of an Aemilianus *rhetor* mentioned in Plutarch.[19] A *grammaticus* of the first half of the first century A.D., one Epitherses, might challenge this paternity, as his son Aemilianus was a *rhetor*. That suits our present investigation rather well, for this latter pair came from Nicaea, the native city of Cassius Dio. So did the

18. *Deip.* 1.20c (a passage not alluded to by Bowersock); see earlier on this character's career and relevance.

19. Seneca, *Controv.* 5.34.25; Plutarch, *De defect. orac.* 17. See *PIR*² A 318.

Aemilianus whose poems occur in the *Anthology*. We may have a sophistic family stretching over the generations here; Nicaea was not fecund in men of letters.

Maurus is an imponderable name, for it might have to be taken as an epithet (ethnic or otherwise), not a name at all. The vituperative Palladas lampoons a Maurus *rhetor*, as does the poet Ammianus; in both cases, Maurus has been taken as an ethnic.[20]

Various Aemiliani did well in the later second and early third centuries. Consulars are registered for 227, 259, and 276.[21] More pertinently to the present discussion, it is a name with close African associations. One thinks of Sicinius Aemilianus, the enemy of Apuleius. Also of Asellius Aemilianus, thought to be an African on the strength of his kinship with Clodius Albinus. In spite (or because) of this tie, Aemilianus supported the cause of Niger, and was executed by Severus in the wake of the defeat of that cause.[22]

Dio[23] describes Asellius Aemilianus as a man of wide provincial experience, without equal in the senatorial order for political acumen, and (inevitably, one supposes) most conceited. Since his sons were in Rome in the civil war period (Severus had them seized as hostages), we may infer that he had a residence in the capital.[24]

No source says anything about the intellectual pastimes of Asellius Aemilianus. To cover this, the matter of courtesy titles is invoked from above. One might simply take Maurus to indicate African connections. Or better, and it would suit the humour of Athenaeus, support of Niger. For the deipnosophist did not disdain puns,[25] and could have relished the spectacle of rivals called Albinus and Niger.

All this is but conjecture, albeit valid in principle. One does not need a precise identification to realise that distinguished Aemiliani were in no shortage in Athenaeus' general period. To have such a one at Larensis' house makes for sound dramatic realism.

One more thing. The *Historia Augusta*[26] once invokes a certain Aelius Maurus, supposedly the freedman of Phlegon (Hadrian's *libertus*), for an item concerning the death of Septimius Severus. If Aelius Maurus is a fabrication,[27] could he have been inspired by Aemilianus Maurus? The Severan context would work. Or would anyone venture the reverse fabrication?

---

20. *AP* 11.204 (Palladas), 16.20 (Ammianus); *PLRE* 1,570 takes Maurus as an ethnic in both cases.
21. *PIR*² A 315–317.
22. On Sicinius, see Birley, 50; on Asellius, Birley, 55, 137, 163, 172, 279.
23. 75.6.1–2.
24. Herodian 3.2.3.
25. Observe a good one in 8.365e.
26. *Sev.* 20.1.
27. He is briskly dismissed by Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968), 60.

2. Alceides of Alexandria. This musician is curtly introduced at the end of the inaugural parade of guests (1.1f). He is allowed only one contribution to the talk, appropriately on the subject of music and musical instruments (4.174b–4.185a).

Kaibel had no bright ideas about this character. It is easy to believe in a musician from Alexandria, and we have shown that such an artist was admissible to the gatherings and rank of sophists. Even if he is a fiction, it will have been a nice touch to have him emanate from Alexandria. For that city was oddly poor in the production of sophists. This may just have been in the mind of Athenaeus when he makes Ulpian ridicule the Alexandrians as an unmusical lot (4.174b; 4.175e).

A more subtle approach would be to bear in mind the use of Alceides as a poetic name for Heracles (Athenaeus, 1.33c, quotes a line with this epithet), and look for someone called Heraclius or perhaps Heracleides. The latter name is that of one of Philostratus' sophists.[28] He comes from the wrong place, Lycia not Alexandria, but belongs to the early years of Severus' reign. Apart from being a famous glutton, which might betoken a deipnosophist, Heracleides had strong associations with Egypt in general (many flocked from that country to study under him at Smyrna) and Naucratis in particular (he was a rival of both Ptolemy and Apollonius).

3. Amoebeus. This fellow is imported near the end of the banquet; he is allowed one brief quotation, and a dazzling display of his vocal and instrumental talents (14.622c–14.623d).

Late arrival is a motif of symposiac literature, as any reader of Plato, Petronius, and Lucian knows.[29] It might also be suspicious that he has the name of a famous harpist of old.[30] However, Athenaeus acknowledges this with a comparison between the two, which may imply that he is not trying to pass off an antique virtuoso as one of his guests. It is insisted that his Amoebeus is a contemporary (14.622d), though that in itself will not disarm the sceptic. Of relevance here is the account given by Alceides of his fellow citizen and musician, Alexander, who has just died after creating a sensation in Rome with his triangle playing (4.183e). A vogue for musicians will have aided their claims to rank as sophists, and increases the chances of their presence at the table of one such as Larensis.

4. Arrian. One of the grammarians, Arrian is omitted from the formal list of guests at the beginning. He appears in only one sequence (3.113a–3.113d),

28. See *VS*, p. 613 f. for all that follows on this sophist.

29. Alcibiades is late and drunk in Plato's *Symposium*. So is Habinnas in the *Satyricon*; Petronius may have been parodying Plato (for the notion, Averil Cameron in *CQ* N.S. 19 (1969), 367). Lucian, *Conv.* 20, has his doctor come late after a house call to a patient: *that* is more implausible to modern ears than ancient ones!

30. Plutarch, *Aratus* 17.

discoursing on bread. When brought in, he is merely "one of the grammarians," but at the close of his lecturette, he has improved to the status of "the great Roman sophist" (this may or may not be a sarcasm).[31] He is admired for his scholarship by the *bon vivant* Magnus, but is brushed aside by Cynulcus, who dubs him (twice) Blepsias.[32]

One cannot help thinking of the versatile historian-philosopher Flavius Arrianus. For a good reason, in the present context. He is respected by Magnus, who flourished early enough in the Antonine period to know Hadrian's clever freedman, Aristomenes of Athens, about whom we have already wondered. Has Athenaeus contrived this overlap for a purpose?

It may or may not be true that Dio Cassius composed a biography of Arrian the historian.[33] The name is frequently encountered. A jurist Arrian is cited more than once in the *Digest* by Ulpian and Paulus.[34] Some might want to fasten on the Arrian-Ulpian conjunction, for obvious reasons. L. Annius Arrianus was a consular in 243.[35] Arrian was a name of interest and some eminence throughout the age of Athenaeus. Even if the deipnosophist Arrian is a fiction, he has been well named for dramatic realism.

A *rerum scriptor Graecus* is thrice cited by the *Historia Augusta* under the name of Arrian.[36] This is generally taken to be an error or a prank for Herodian.[37] Could it be instead that the biographer lifted his Arrian from the *Deipnosophistae*? One looks back to Aemilianus Maurus and Aelius Maurus.

5. Cynulcus. This is the nickname of Theodorus, and one that he himself prefers (4.160d). It is a natural tag for the vicious Cynic opponent of Ulpian. Kaibel regarded it as *nomen e Parmenisci symposio petitum* . . . . That may be right, but it is not necessary. The name is originally an epithet, denoting the leading of dogs;[38] its present suitability needs no comment.

Cynulcus is one of Ulpian's two great rivals, and the second most frequent speaker at the banquet. A voluble Cynic in the second century is no surprise. Theodorus is a common name at all periods. Athenaeus mentions twelve of them, apart from Cynulcus; there are nearly thirty bearers of the name, including sophists, doctors, and philosophers, in the first volume of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. It requires little effort to believe in a Cynic Theodorus who actually operated in Athenaeus' time.

---

31. He is dubbed μεγαλοσοφιστής, a word unique to this passage.
32. Translated by Gulick as 'Bright Eyes'; it might be βλεψίας (= fish), a word employed in an icthyological treatise by Dorion, cited at *Deip.* 7.306 f.
33. Claimed by the *Suda*; disbelieved by F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 70.
34. *PIR*² A 1078.
35. *PIR*² A 635; cf. *HA, Gord.* 29.1.
36. *Max.* 33.3; *Gord.* 2.1; *Max-Balb.* 1.2 (always joined with Dexippus).
37. Thus Stein, *PIR*² A 1078; Magie, Loeb edition of *HA*.
38. *LSJ* registered only Nicolaus of Damascus for the adjective. The *Supplement* adds *PSA Athen.* 2.2.

6. Daphnus. One of the medicals, Daphnus is said to be from Ephesus. He has to be taken in conjunction with another of the physicians at table, Rufinus of Nicaea. Kaibel took them as fictions, compounded from Rufus of Ephesus, a doctor attested for the period of Domitian and Trajan.

Rufinus is curtly introduced by name only (1.1f), and is not once permitted to open his mouth throughout the banquet. Daphnus, by signal contrast, is ushered in with all honour as a man ἱερός in both profession and character, and as a well-versed Platonist (1.1e).

And yet, for all this glory, Daphnus is brought in as "a certain Daphnus" when he makes his first contribution to the talk (2.51a). Subsequently, he is simply referred to by name. As in the case of Galen, his sequences are brief and entirely concerned with diet and health (2.51a; 3.79a–3.80e; 3.120b–3.121e; 7.276d; 8.355a–8.359d). Again as with Galen, there is no hint of philosophical expertise after the formal introduction.

We should here subjoin the fourth medical man at table, Dionysocles. He is omitted from the formal introductions, and given two tiny speeches, both on diet and health (3.96d; 3.116d–3.116f).

Two patterns are discernible. Learned physicians are a real-life convention of the second century. Their presence at symposia also provokes no surprise. Athenaeus has yoked fact and motif together in including medical men in his dialogue.

But it is also patent that he wishes to minimise their role in the verbal transactions. Either it is a subtle compliment—the doctors being viewed as too bored by the pedantic descantings to contribute much—or a desire to depreciate their status as sophists. The latter is the simpler view, one reinforced by Athenaeus' quip on the insuperable stupidity of physicians (15.666a). The humour of Athenaeus will also have to be admitted as a factor here. For doctors (notably Galen) were on the right side in sectarian conflict with Atticists and linguistic purists. So, at least upon many an occasion in his narrative, was Athenaeus of Naucratis.

A prosopographical glance at the trio of doctors (Galen is obviously to be excluded here) may strengthen the above contention. There is nothing to be discovered about Daphnus or Dionysocles. But the silent Rufinus of Nicaea is more interesting. For he might be redolent of the consular (142) L. Cuspius Pactumeius Rufinus, a figure closely associated with the great doctor Galen and the great patient Aelius Aristides, famed for building the great Asclepium around 150.[39] An alternative is to consider Rufinus the sophist, one of the bastard sons of Apollonius of Naucratis, and totally subservient to his father's sophistic repertoire.[40]

It is to be iterated that such observations as the above are not to be regarded as precise identifications. The point is, as in earlier cases, that Athenaeus'

39. On this, consult Bowersock, 60–1.
40. Philostratus, *VS*, p. 599.

characters, even if invented, are designed to a pattern of dramatic plausibility. The notion of a farrago of names from all ages is most vulnerable.

7. Democritus. He is coupled in the formal introductions with Pontianus. Both are polymaths from Nicomedia (1.1d). Kaibel dismissed Democritus as a simple reproduction of the sage of Abdera; Pontianus of Nicomedia was claimed to be a confection from Nicomedes of Bithynia.

Nicomedia is the only city overtly contributing two deipnosophists. That both are philosophers is worthy of remark; Nicomedia was the provenance of Arrian. It is a city that emitted one of Philostratus' worthies, the successful Quirinus.[41] Once again, Athenaeus has made his details conform to historical fact.

Of the two names, Democritus may elicit suspicion. But Pontianus of Nicomedia has unimpeachable credentials, since one such is known from an inscription.[42] We shall also cast an eye at Pontius Proculus Pontianus, a consul in 238.[43]

8. Leonides. Deriving from Elis, he is commended along with Plutarch, Aemilianus, and Zoilus as an elegant critic. His few intrusions (3.96d; 3.116a; 9.367d–9.368f; 11.504b; 13.558e–13.560f) are entirely unmemorable, except perhaps for the last, in which he counters Larensis' praise of the married state. Staid Roman versus flighty Greek?

The name, to be distinguished from Leonidas, is not a common one. One observes with some delight that it occurs in a long register of great generals trained by Probus in the *Historia Augusta*.[44] Elis was not a town in any way notable for the production of scholars in the Antonine or Severan periods.[45] Kaibel fought shy of any speculation concerning Leonides. The Budé editor,[46] having pointed out a Leonidas of Elis in Pausanias,[47] rushes on to connect Athenaeus' character with the great Spartan king. That is a fine example of the inferiority of second thoughts.

9. Magnus. His name, and a reference by him to the beauty of Rome (3.74e), together suggest that he was a Roman. This notion could be reinforced by his siding with Larensis on the issue of fake philosophers (4.160d), and by his passion for the table, which merits him the unique epithet φιλοτράπεζος

41. *VS*. p. 620; his name is emended to Quirinius by Millar, 177, and Bowersock, 22 n. 1.
42. *IG* ii 3265 (noticed by Gulick).
43. See Birley, 352; G. Barbieri, *L'Albo senatorio de Settimio a Carino* (Rome, 1952), no. 1137. His origin cannot be traced.
44. *Probus* 22.3: stigmatised by *PLRE*, recorded without comment in *PIR*² L 148, and allowed as possibly authentic even by Syme, *AHA*, 171, and *EB*, 213.
45. Leonidas, the poet of the *Anthology*, is connected with Alexandria or Tarentum (*PIR*² L 147.)
46. Introd., xvii.
47. 5.15.2.

(3.113e). Magnus harks back to the age of Hadrian: also he is a devotee of Arrian, that 'great sophist of the Romans'.

Magnus is the only guest, apart from Athenaeus and the host, who is not formally associated with the professions or the arts. One could hardly pretend to identify him on the details furnished by Athenaeus. Still, a guest of Larensis with this name impels mention of M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus, who prospered under Commodus and went on under Severus.[48] By flagrant contrast, there was a Pactumeius Magnus (consul in 183), slain by Commodus in an alleged pogrom of consulars.[49]

10. Masurius. A more momentous name. He is the first deipnosophist to be introduced, and receives the most elaborate and the most fulsome description (1.1c). By profession a jurist, he was a famed polymath, an encyclopaedic fellow since childhood, an outstanding poet with special expertise in Archilochian satire. Near the end of the feast (14.623e), it is further disclosed that he was also proficient in music. The last attribute serves to consolidate the respectability of our two men of music, earlier discussed.

His contributions are fairly frequent, sometimes lengthy, and on a variety of topics. Not that any supremacy in learning can be ceded to a particular deipnosophist! Kaibel simplistically equated him with the distinguished jurist of Tiberius' reign. Yet Masurius is not outside the conventions of the Second Sophistic. The occasional sophist turned his hand to poetry. Most pertinent to the present discussion is Hippodromus of Thessaly, one of Philostratus' favourites. He was a celebrated devotee of Archilochus, whom he called the very breath of the sophists.[50]

The enthusiasms of Masurius are credible enough. We may look a little further, in that speculation over possible identity or echo could, not for the first time, involve the *Historia Augusta*. In the life of Elagabalus,[51] Ulpian the jurist dedicates some of his books to a consular by the name of Sabinus. This has been dismissed as a fraud based on the name of the Tiberian Masurius Sabinus.[52] But what if the Masurius of Athenaeus were a cover-name for a contemporary Sabinus? Nomenclature, expertise, chronology—all converge.

11. Myrtilus. The major speaker, after Ulpian and Cynulcus. Oddly omitted from the formal muster of guests (though that might be due to the deficiencies of the extracts which are all that survive of the first two books), he is far more than a doublet[53] of Cynulcus. Indeed, he is one of the few wiseacres for whom Athenaeus adumbrates a career. An old man (seemingly: it is implied at

48. Barbieri, *L'Albo*, no. 215; Birley, 342–3.
49. *HA, Comm.* 7.6.
50. *VS*, p. 620.
51. 16.2.
52. Thus Syme (*EB*, 120), after Dessau in *Hermes* 27 (1892), 578.
53. As Gulick (xiii) calls him.

13.608f), Myrtilus came from Thessaly; the origin is mentioned several times (1.11b; 7.308b; 13.568d; 15.677a). His father was a cobbler (13.568e). Myrtilus for a season was a sophist resident in Corinth (13.567c; 13.573c). He journeyed at least once, from Synnada to Metropolis in northern Phrygia (13.574f).

There is nothing here that cannot be believed. It is true that shoemakers are something of a motif in Cynical literature.[54] For all that, it was occasionally possible for a sophist to rise from humble origins. Apart from the well-known case of Lucian (not all that poor, in reality), there was Secundus of Athens, whose father was a carpenter, and Apollonius of Naucratis who started out as a household flunkey.[55]

Thessaly produces sophists. Philostratus[56] tends to be rather scornful of men from that area, an attitude reflected in Athenaeus' stressing of Myrtilus' provenance. For all that, the biographer of the sophists is elaborate and keen on Hippodromus of Thessaly.[57] There was also Philiscus from that area, who features in the notorious reference to the "circle" of Julia Domna.[58] Epigraphy has brought to light at least one family of sophists from Thessaly.[59]

The relevance of Corinth to sophistic residence and performance requires no exegesis. Of greater fascination is the journey undertaken by Myrtilus in Phrygia. It is alluded to in the context of Hadrian's travels in that area. It has now been made clear[60] that Polemo visited that part of the world with Hadrian. Another item for our previous aggregation of links or reminiscences concerning Polemo in the *Deipnosophistae*.

12. Palamedes. An Eleatic lexicographer, not formally introduced, and allowed only a quotation of six words in the entire dialogue (9.397a). The presence of a lexicographer is unsurprising. One thinks of Phrynichus of Bithynia and Pollux of Naucratis, both of whom did well under Commodus. The nullity of Palamedes' contribution to the talk may have been contrived by Athenaeus to imply contempt for his particular activities.

13. Philadelphus of Ptolemais. He never overtly speaks at the banquet, but is intriguingly presented (1.1d) as a man who was experienced in real life as much as philosophy. That would seem to imply a recognisable contemporary, either by way of compliment or censure. For Athenaeus, it is a unique form of introduction, most tantalisingly applied to a silent participant. Another of the author's jokes?

---

54. Noted by Gulick (*ibid.*), following R. Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig, 1906) and making too much of it.
55. On Lucian, see B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto, 1973), 12-13. *VS*, p. 544 (Secundus), P. 599 (Apollonius).
56. *VS*, p. 501, p. 616.
57. *VS*, p. 615.
58. *VS*, p. 622.
59. Namely the Flavii Alexander, Phylax and Phoenix (*PIR*² F 199; Bowersock, 4 n. 2.).
60. By Bowersock, 120–23.

Kaibel drably equated this character with Ptolemy Philadelphus. It is just as reasonable, and emphatically more exciting, to look at somebody like Flavius Boethus.[61] This man was a consular, a patron of Galen, a dabbler in philosophy—and a product of Ptolemais. From the frequent references to him in Galen, he fits the description of one who knew about real life.

So, of course, did most sophists. It is not to say that we have an exact equation. Rather, yet one more demonstration of the plausibility of Athenaeus' characters, in terms of provenance, chronology, and attainments.

14. Plutarch. A rare case of a scholar emanating from Alexandria. Which does not render his claims to an existence invalid. To the contrary, perhaps; it is hard to accept that the productive record of that city was a blank. Its lack of such a role in Philostratus does not so prove.[62]

Athenaeus imports his Plutarch as one of the elegant scholars (1.1c). The grammarian delivers quite frequent sermons, sometimes lengthy, on all manner of topics (4.134d–4.156a; 6.234c–6.248c; 7.276a; 8.359d–8.361e; 9.348a–9.384c; 11.461e–11.503f; 13.562c–13.563c). Kaibel thought he might have dominated the peculiar Book Twelve.[63] Plutarch is not described beyond his Alexandrian citizenship, except in that he betrays an impatience with Myrtilus and Cynulcus (3.86b; 3.119a; 4.158d).

It was inevitable that Kaibel should conjure up Plutarch of Chaeronea as the prototype. Labouring under the twin disadvantages of different provenance and the fact that one would hardly call the biographer a grammarian, Kaibel rested everything on the common use of the symposiac motif. In fact, at least five Plutarchs are attested for the fourth century;[64] there is no warrant for denying that a Plutarch of Alexandria could have existed in the Antonine or Severan periods.

15. Varus. A grammarian missing in the formal introduction and granted only one small intervention (3.118d–3.118e), on the subject of pickled fish.

His name is borne by two of Philostratus' sophists. There was Varus of Perge,[65] known as "the stork," who died young in his native town, leaving a high reputation for his sons to enjoy there. Perhaps more to the point is Varus of Laodicea, almost certainly of Severan date, who is the victim of Philostratus' most crushing notice.[66] That obscure Varus who was antipathetic to Polemo

61. *PIR*² F 229, and Bowersock, 62, for his career and the Galen references.
62. See C. P. Jones, "The Reliability of Philostratus," in *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (Pennsylvania, 1974), 11.
63. It is peculiar in that no speakers are assigned to any part of this book. Perhaps one ought to take it as representing Athenaeus' own major effort at the symposium? The phenomenon is hard to explain, and may distort the roles of all the deipnosophists.
64. *PLRE* 1, 707–8.
65. *VS*, p. 576; Bowersock, 22 n. 3, for the idea that his *nomen* was Plancius.
66. *VS*, p. 620; for his date, Bowersock-Jones, *Approaches to the Second Sophistic*, 40.

was noticed earlier. It is clear that a scholarly Varus is a plausible member of the company around the table of Larensis.

16. Zoilus. This grammarian is introduced as one of the elegant academics (1.1d); he speaks once on fish (7.277c 7.277e) and once on Attic words and formations (9.366c–9.367d).

Any Zoilus has an obvious ancestor in the history of scholarship. However, the fact that there was a *corrector* of Sicily with this name in the fourth century[67] demonstrates that there could have been a flesh-and-blood Zoilus in the age of Athenaeus.

From time to time, the dialogues of Athenaeus serve to complement the biographies of Philostratus, and perhaps illumine items of fact or nomenclature in Dio and *Historia Augusta*. One cheerfully acknowledges that many will continue to leaf through the *Deipnosophistae* only as a farrago of sources and sauces. But it is also a document for the student of imperial Rome, above all for those engaged in the analysis of the Second Sophistic in the Rome of the Antonines and Severans.

67. *PLRE* 1, 944.

ROMAN SOCIAL HISTORY

LXVI

TWO ASPECTS OF THE SPARTACUS SLAVE REVOLT

OF THE MANY TRAGIC SLAVE revolts against the Roman authorities in Italy and Sicily in the second and first centuries B.C., the one led by the Thracian Spartacus is easily the most famous. To a large extent this is a modern phenomenon, inspired by an efflorescence of novels and films on the subject.[1] Spartacus has been elevated into a conscious revolutionary leader of oppressed slaves and free proletariat, a leader with definite ideals and a definite social program.[2] For this reason alone, a fresh look at the available evidence is desirable. This investigation should be made in the context of the slave revolts of the preceding century, not merely the First Sicilian Slave War, which has been very well documented in recent years,[3] but other less familiar outbreaks in Italy. The other main aspect which I hope to bring out is the Roman reaction to slave uprisings, the quality of the Roman personnel involved, how and why the State responded as it did to this perpetual menace, and whether it had any policy other than brutal repression.

The complexities and the proper sequence of the military engagements between Spartacus and the Romans have been ably disentangled by Rice Holmes,[4] and I do not intend any discussion of them here. The obscurities result from the poor quality of the surviving ancient sources, and this is a vital point to remember when attempting to reconstruct the personality and policies of Spartacus. Of Livy's account we have only the *Epitome*. The fullest accounts survive in Plutarch's life of Crassus and in Appian's *Civil wars*, but these are considerably *post eventum* and exhibit many discrepancies. Both Plutarch and Appian may have used Sallust's *Historiae*, but only tantalizing fragments of these remain. Florus gives a brief and hostile account, and more or less scrappy notices are included in Velleius Paterculus, Frontinus, Orosius and Eutropius.[5] None of these have any claim to be called authoritative; they are especially suspect in their conflicting and exaggerated figures of slaves involved and final casualty lists. It is possible to reconstruct a narrative out of them, but little more can be done with any confidence. And, of course, they are all pro-Roman. As Scullard suggests,[6] Sallust may not have been entirely hostile to Spartacus, and we might have had a sympathetic account in the lost monograph on the Slave Wars composed by Caecilius of Cale Acte.[7] But in general the ancient accounts are emotionally against the slaves,

[1] Notably *The gladiators*, by Arthur Koestler (1939) and *Spartacus*, by Howard Fast (1952). Both are worth reading for the very different characterizations of Spartacus.

[2] Remember the adoption of his name by the socialist revolutionary elements in Germany in the 1918 period.

[3] Peter Green, "The First Sicilian Slave War," *Past and present* (20 Nov. 1961) 10ff.

[4] *The Roman republic* (Oxford 1923), Vol.1, pp.155ff., 386ff.

[5] General references: Livy, *Epitome* 95; Velleius Paterculus 2.30; Florus 2.8; Frontinus, *Strat.* 1.5.20ff.; 1.7.6; 2.5.34; Plutarch, *Crassus* 8; Appian, *BC* 1.116; Orosius 5.24; Eutropius 6.7.

[6] H. H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero* (London 1959), p.400.

[7] Referred to in Athenaeus 6.272.

just as our modern sympathies go out to them for purely emotional reasons.

As is well known, the revolt began in 73 when Spartacus and a few gladiators rioted in the gladiatorial school of Cn. Lentulus at Capua, fought their way out with weapons improvised from kitchen utensils and other implements, seized weapons which they had the good fortune to encounter being carried by carts to another school in Capua, and fled the city. The fullest account is given by Plutarch, who says that the insurgents were mainly Thracians and Gauls or Germans who had been confined because of their masters' cruelty, not their own wrongdoing. He further says that although 200 of them had initially planned to break out, this plot had been detected or betrayed and only 78 achieved escape. This number 78 (with slight variants) is recorded by the other authorities, but only Plutarch mentions any premeditated plan of escape on a large scale. The general impression is of a sudden eruption of violence, inspired perhaps by the punishment of a gladiator or some such grievance.

By common consent Spartacus is named as the leader of this outbreak. Yet we know few personal details. Plutarch describes him as a Thracian of great physical power, clever and more intelligent and humane than was usual with men of his nationality.[8] Appian says he was a Thracian who had been a mercenary or auxiliary with the Roman army, but had been sold as a gladiator after desertion and recapture.[9] Florus repeats these details with his usual contempt, adding that Spartacus had been a brigand.[10] Plutarch adds that he was accompanied by a mistress or wife who was given to prophetic frenzy and who had foretold a great future for him as the result of a snake's coiling around his head as he slept. This point is exotic to modern readers, but important. It is impossible to say how much Spartacus felt himself called to action by religious inspiration, but a similar motif pervades the career of Eunus, the leader of the First Sicilian Slave War,[11] and Thracians were receptive to such notions. Plutarch does not give the woman's name.

Associated with Spartacus as leaders of the insurgents are Crixus and Oenomaus. Plutarch does not give their names; Appian couples them as subordinates (ὑποστρατήγους) to Spartacus. This is certainly incorrect. Both are shadowy figures, especially Oenomaus, who seems to have been killed in one of the first engagements with the Romans; but Crixus emerged as the acknowledged leader of the Gallic and German contingents. These soon ceased to pay any attention to Spartacus, who attempted to curb their zeal for plunder and rapine,[12] and Crixus led his supporters in a breakaway movement which led to their being crushed at Mt. Garganus by Gellius and Arrius. Toward the end of the revolt, when blockaded around Rhegium by Crassus, the Gauls and Germans were led in another secession by Gannicus and Castus. These paid the same penalty as Crixus, despite an attempt by Spartacus (quixotic or in self-interest?) to save them from the consequences of their folly. These fatal dissensions are a striking contrast to the solidarity of the two bands led by Eunus and Cleon in the First Sicilian War. Spartacus seems to have had influence over only the Thracian elements in his army, and it is well known that the final engagement of the revolt was forced on Spartacus by the misguided confidence of his remaining followers. The whole movement was fatally torn by nationalist jealousies which wrecked any idealistic policy Spartacus may have entertained.

[8] ἀνὴρ Θρᾷξ, οὐ μόνον φρόνημα μέγα καὶ ῥώμην ἔχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνέσει καὶ πραότητι τῆς τύχης ἀμείνων καὶ τοῦ γένους Ἑλληνικώτερος.

[9] Θρᾷξ ἀνήρ, ἐστρατευμένος ποτὲ Ῥωμαίοις, ἐκ δὲ αἰχμαλωσίας καὶ πράσεως ἐν τοῖς μονομάχοις ὤν.

[10] Ille de stipendiario Thrace miles, de milite desertor, inde latro, deinde in honorem virium gladiator.

[11] See the discussion by Green, *op. cit.*

[12] Sallust, *Historiae* (ed. Maurenbrecher), and Plutarch are our sources for this.

Did Spartacus have a fixed policy? It is difficult to decide. Plutarch credits him with unusual intelligence, but may refer only to his military abilities, which were clearly outstanding. One or two facets of primitive communism may be seen lurking; Appian says that Spartacus initially tried to divide all spoil equally (*κατ' ἰσομοιρίαν*), and that later, when occupying the hills around Thurii, he prohibited the use of gold and silver by his followers. We have seen that he tried to restrain Crixus from atrocities, though after the latter's death he sacrificed 300 captives to his ghost. Spartacus' main desire seems to have been to lead his followers to the Alps and disperse at least the Thracians to their own land. This is borne out by his movements and by Plutarch. This did not meet with the approval of Crixus, however, who apparently wanted to settle down to a career of brigandage in Italy. Regrettably, this may have been the more realistic policy. Spartacus' idea could hardly have been attractive to the many native *pastores* who joined his band; it would not have profited them much to leave Italy, and among the many slaves who joined the revolt there must have been men of many nationalities who had no hope of returning to their own lands and who would care nothing for Thrace.

That Spartacus wanted to destroy Rome and establish a utopia without slaves may be emotionally attractive to modern taste, but it seems very doubtful, and is impossible to prove. Green points out that in the First Sicilian War many of the insurgents were Cilicians and others who did not like being slaves themselves but had no objection to slavery as an institution. Spartacus' followers included many such people. Theoretically, he might have rekindled the embers of anti-Roman feeling left over from the Social War, but even this would not have meant an antislavery movement. No Italian city joined him by choice, nor did his outbreak inspire a slave disturbance in Rome such as Eunus had achieved.[13] His abortive attempt to cross over to Sicily is problematic, though well attested by our authorities and by Cicero.[14] Plutarch is the source for his attempt to utilize the aid of the Cilician pirates and his betrayal by them; Plutarch also says that he meant to send across a vanguard of 2000 men to stir up trouble. Both these statements are possibly true. Sicily was the obvious place for the leader of a slave revolt to raise support, or at least to create a diversion for the Roman authorities, and the Cilicians were usually ready to help the enemies of Rome, especially for pay.[15] But it is just as possible that the project was an act of sheer desperation, especially if we believe Florus' assertion that Spartacus tried to organize a crossing on improvised rafts. Certainly, as a scheme, the Sicilian crossing does not harmonize with his former policy.

The claims that Spartacus intended a march on Rome are very dubious. According to Florus, he entertained the project after defeating Lentulus at Mutina, but went south. Appian claims that he began to consider the possibility after the death of Crixus and his defeat of Gellius and Lentulus, but shelved it on the grounds that his men were not suitably armed or of sufficient caliber.[16] Plutarch suggests that Crassus feared Spartacus might attempt this after he had broken the Rhegium blockade, but nowhere that Spartacus considered it. Appian seems to give the correct diagnosis, and I agree with him and Rice Holmes that it is very doubtful whether he ever seriously entertained the scheme. Spartacus was in much the same dilemma as Hannibal after Cannae, and he was surely general enough to know that he had not the slightest chance of taking Rome by

[13] Diodorus 34.2.19: *κατά τε Ῥώμην δούλων ἀπόστασις ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα συνομοσάντων ἀνήπτετο.*

[14] *In Verrem* 5.2.5: illud audivimus, M. Crassi, fortissimi viri, virtute consilioque factum ne ratibus conjunctis freto fugitivi ad Messanam transire possent.

[15] H. Ormerod, *Piracy in the ancient world* (Liverpool 1914), p.223, notes how the Cilicians helped enemies of the Roman authorities such as Sertorius.

[16] Being only *θεράποντες καὶ αὐτόμολοι καὶ σύγκλυδες.*

storm. Not only had he no siege weapons, but he would certainly have been taken in the rear by fresh Roman legions. A mad dash on Rome might have appealed to Crixus, but the majority of the rebels would have had little taste for a protracted siege, if they could ever have established one.

Spartacus failed, of course, and Pompey and Crassus exacted a grim revenge for the losses in men and prestige Rome had suffered over the two years of the revolt.[17] Spartacus himself is said by Plutarch, Appian, and Florus to have died in action, fighting fiercely to the end, though wounded in the thigh. Appian adds that his corpse was not found: a more dramatic end than that of Eunus, who ended his days rotting in prison in Sicily. The tragedy of Spartacus, as with all the previous slave revolts, was that he was bound to fail, whether he was idealist or desperado.

This brings me to the second main aspect of this paper. Were the Roman authorities guilty of initial negligence in dealing with the outbreak? Did Crassus redeem lost Roman prestige which a timid or foolish Senate, abetted by inefficient commanders, had squandered? Had they learned nothing from previous experience with slave revolts?

If we examine the slave revolts before Spartacus, it becomes clear that the Senate had no tradition of treating such outbreaks with dangerous nonchalance. Livy makes Scipio encourage the Roman troops before battle in 218 with the words: "Vos ego, milites, non eo solum animo quo adversus alios hostes soletis pugnare velim, sed cum indignatione quadam atque ira, velut si servos videatis vestros arma repente contra vos ferentes" (21.41.10). Granting that Livy is the real author of the speech, the attribution of such an attitude to this period is significant.

Rome was faced with a dangerous though abortive slave uprising in 198. Livy, who tells the story, says that *circa urbem servilis prope tumultus est excitatus* (32.26.4). The conspiracy was formed by the slaves of Carthaginian hostages in custody at Setia, augmented by African prisoners of war. They dispatched envoys to stir up the slaves in Setia, Norba, and Circeii, planning to strike whilst the Setians were engrossed in the Games. Setia was indeed captured, but not Norba or Circeii. In Rome, the praetor urbanus, L. Cornelius Lentulus, was informed by two slaves of this *tam foedae* event. He reported to the Senate, which promptly authorized him to take all measures necessary to quell the rising. Lentulus set out with five lieutenants, raising a levy of troops en route (*obvios in agris sacramento rogatos arma capere et sequi cogebat*). Reaching Setia, he arrested the ringleaders and rounded up the slaves, who quickly fled from the town. Shortly afterwards, the remnants of the conspirators were detected in a plot to seize Praeneste. This was foiled by Lentulus, who executed 500 suspects there. To thwart any outbreak in Rome the city was put under virtual martial law.[18]

Two years later, a threatened servile revolt in Etruria was put down by Manius Acilius Glabro, praetor peregrinus, who crushed the movement with one of the city legions. He scourged and crucified the ringleaders and returned the other captives to their masters (33.36). In dealing with this attempted uprising and the previous one, which were no more than isolated plots by desperate men and foreigners and prisoners of war, the Senate and the military acted with all speed and took no chances of the movement's spreading.

Far more serious was the First Sicilian Slave War, which broke out in 135 and

[17] The famous mass crucifixion of the 6000 surviving slaves is mentioned only by Appian, but this had become the traditional punishment for revolting slaves as early as 196 (then restricted to the ringleaders).

[18] 32.26.17: Romae vigiliae per vicos servatae iussique circumire eas minores magistratus, et triumviri carceris lautumiarum intentiorem custodiam habere iussi, et circa nomen Latinum a praetore litterae missae, ut et obsides in privato servarentur neque in publicum prodeundi facultas daretur, et captivi ne minus decem pondo compedibus vincti in nulla alia quam in carceris publici custodia essent.

lasted until 132. Green has made a skillful reconstruction from the surviving narratives of Diodorus 34. The revolt was inspired by Eunus, the Syrian slave who called himself King Antiochus, allied with the Sicilian brigand chief Cleon. Eunus emerges in a much clearer light than Spartacus. He is credited with a program of social reform, a subtle use of stage-managed miracles and prophecies to inspire his followers, and military skill. He was far better prepared than Spartacus and had with him a group of capable leaders, one faction of whom stood out successfully against acts of atrocity by the insurgents. Conditions in Sicily were ripe for such an uprising. The threat to Rome was obvious; one of the most serious consequences was that the revolt sparked a whole series of slave uprisings in Rome, Minturnae, Sinuessa, and elsewhere.[19] This was something Spartacus failed to achieve.

The Roman response to this threat is often criticized as halfhearted. This is unfair. Diodorus makes the point that the Roman praetor was prevented from making a swift and decisive response because he was too afraid of the latifundia owners to exact the necessary crushing reprisals (34.2.3). This could be a rare case of Diodorus' making a good diagnosis; it was these men who largely provoked the revolt by their brutality, and this sort of corruption was later to permit the career of Verres. Moreover, the Romans were faced with a double menace; Eunus took Enna, a success closely followed by Cleon's capture of Agrigentum. Cleon had a ready-made following of experienced fighters, and the vast numbers of followers attributed to Eunus may be more credible than to Spartacus. Small wonder, then, that the praetor L. Hypsaeus was cut to pieces with 8000 Sicilian levies. Disaffection in his own ranks is likely. Eunus went on to capture Tauromenium, allegedly through the negligence of Q. Fabius. The fortress of Morgantina was taken, but a siege of Syracuse failed; Messana remained apart from the revolt. In 134 the consul C. Fulvius Flaccus had several armies destroyed, but there is no evidence that this was the result of any scandalous neglect or inefficiency. The following year saw L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi fail to take Enna, but he captured Morgantina with great slaughter; the survivors were crucified. In Rome, the Senate was involved in the struggle with Tiberius Gracchus, but this did not make them forget their responsibilities to Sicily. In 132 the consul Rupilius captured Tauromenium and Enna with immense bloodshed; survivors were crucified or hung in chains. Eunus had escaped with his bodyguard of 1000, but the men committed mass suicide, and Eunus was taken in a cave, to end his days in prison.

Almost at once the revolt of Aristonicus broke out in Asia. Though appealing to slave support with promises of a utopian City of the Sun where all should be free, he can hardly be called a champion of the oppressed. Credit for any such schemes goes more readily to the philosopher Blossius of Cumae, who had fled to him after the defeat of Tiberius Gracchus.[20] The revolt was eventually suppressed by M. Perpena and the consul Aquilius. The Second Sicilian Slave War (103-101) was another two-pronged movement, led by Salvius or King Tryphon in the south and the Cilician Athenion in the west. This was crushed by 101, no mean feat by the Romans in view of the perils they were then facing in the north. Diodorus notes (36.2) that this was preluded by numerous brief outbreaks throughout Italy.

To the Romans, then, Spartacus' outbreak was one more in a very long series. The Senate, though preoccupied by Sertorius in Spain and Mithridates in Asia, did not neglect this danger on their own doorstep. The praetor Claudius Glaber was

[19] According to Orosius 5.9.4, 450 slaves were crucified at Minturnae, and 4000 defeated at Sinuessa. Julius Obsequens 27b notes: in Italia multa milia servorum, quae coniuraverunt, aegre comprehensa et supplicio consumpta.

[20] On Blossius, see D. R. Dudley, *JRS* 31 (1941) 98.

quickly dispatched with 3000 men, and defeated.[21] This may be the only "shameful" defeat of the campaign, since it is doubtful whether Spartacus had many followers at this early stage to add to his nucleus of gladiators. The praetor P. Varinius,[22] his legate L. Furius, and another lieutenant L. Cossinius were all defeated in separate engagements, if we can trust our muddled authorities. In 72 the Senate sent out the consuls to deal with the situation. These were L. Gellius Publicola, a man of great experience, and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus, not the first Cornelius Lentulus in Roman history to be sent to suppress slaves.[23] Gellius proved his worth by defeating Crixus and his band of Germans and Gauls, but was then defeated by Spartacus, as was Lentulus with two legions, and the ex-consul C. Cassius Longinus with ten thousand men who tried to block Spartacus' way to the Alps. After this, Crassus came forward to take over the command from the defeated consuls. The latter ought to be regarded as penalized for Crassus' ambition rather than for their inefficiency. Gellius had one major victory to his credit; Lentulus was defeated but not notably disgraced personally, and Crassus was to find Spartacus no easy enemy. His legate Mummius was defeated with two legions, and despite the fatal secession of Gannicus and Castus, Spartacus broke through the blockade at Rhegium.

With the defeat of Spartacus, the long series of slave wars and attempted uprisings in Sicily came to an end. Improvement in conditions on the latifundia was one important reason for this. To speak of the defeat of an ideal is dangerous. The whole point was that slaves and slaveowners were caught in the same dilemma. Neither could really visualize a world without slaves, and the aim of the majority of the rebels was simply to cease being slaves.

It may be concluded that we know far less about Spartacus' personality and ideals than those of the leaders of the First Sicilian War, and that, judging by our sources, his influence over his followers was very limited. His co-leader Crixus is a most unattractive figure. Spartacus' appeal to the urban slaves and "proletariat" was nonexistent (his revolt did not touch off a single sympathy movement). On the Roman side, the incident cannot fairly be used to convict the senatorial government of gross negligence and incapacity, or the Roman authorities of relying solely on a policy of brutal repression. Rome had had more than a century of experience in dealing with slave revolts and knew what they involved. In all cases experienced military men were quickly authorized to put down the uprisings. That they often suffered defeats does not prove criminal carelessness or inadequacy. Specific moral guilt lay with the brutalities of many large estate owners in Sicily and Italy. But at least after the Lex Rupilia serious attempts were made to improve administration in Sicily. These did not prevent the Second Sicilian Slave War, but improvements are undeniable. Otherwise the defalcations of Verres would not have been so striking, and he would not have been prosecuted by Cicero and seen his own counsel throw in his brief. The fact that Spartacus inspired no support from Sicily in Verres' time, or from the many free Italians that had fought the Social War, indicates that Spartacus could not hope to achieve any concrete ideal such as the abolition of slavery—if he ever wanted to.

[21] On Glaber and the other Roman personnel involved, see T. R. S. Broughton, *MRR* 2.109ff.

[22] Frontinus, *Strat.* 1.5.22, calls him proconsul. See Broughton, *loc. cit.*

[23] Gellius had been praetor peregrinus in 94, proconsul in Asia or Cilicia in 93, and on the military staff of Pompeius Strabo in 88. Lentulus had been praetor in 75. The pair were censors in 70, and both went on to hold Italian navy commands in 67.

LXVII

THE *ACTA DIURNA*

A fascinating thought, in these days of the mass media, that the Romans also had a news bulletin of sorts. And frustrating to have to admit that, save for a dubious item in the ‹Historia Augusta›, not a single fragment survives.[1] No strong warrant, then, for those scholars who have confidently likened the Roman gazette either to the ‹Times› of London[2] or to the modern tabloids.[3]

It is not that we are devoid of knowledge. The fifty or so allusions to the *acta* in our sources permit some reconstruction of the history and content of what we may call (perhaps a trifle romantically) Rome's daily newspaper. Earlier discussions, restricted by and large to the older German and French manuals and to theses and journals not readily accessible,[4] do not always provide accurate or complete assemblages of the primary information. Also, some topics remain very much matters for debate. Not only such points of detail as the distinction (if any) between *acta diurna* and *acta publica* or the longevity of their publication, but also the larger issue of how emperors and others exploited this medium for the purposes of propaganda. Hence the present paper.

In 59, on the evidence of Suetonius (JC 20, 1), Julius Caesar *inito honore primus omnium instituit ut tam senatus quam populi diurna acta confierent et publicarentur.* This presumably means that Caesar was the first Roman so to enact.[5] Nevertheless,

---

[1] A frustration that no doubt helped to inspire the eleven spurious fragments first published in 1615 by Pighius (in his Annales, 2, 378). Defended only by Dodwell, Praelect. Camden., Oxford 1692, 665, and Lieberkühn, Vindiciae librorum iniuria suspectorum, Leipzig 1844, 1, they have been frequently unmasked as a 15th century forgery. See in particular, H. Heinze, De spuriis actorum diurnorum fragmentis, Greifswald 1860; C. Zell, Über die Zeitung der alten Römer, Ferienschriften, Heidelberg 1857, Neue Folge 1, 109.

[2] W. G. Williams, in his Loeb of Cicero, ad fam. (on 2, 15, 5).

[3] E. Posner, Archives of the Ancient World, Harvard 1972, 191.

[4] The fullest study is that of E. Hübner, De senatus populique Romani actis, Leipzig 1859 (= Fleckeisens Jahrb. Suppl. III, 559–632). Cf. G. Humbert, Daremberg-Saglio I, 46–52; Ruggiero, Diz. Epigr. I, 44–62; Kubitschek, RE 1, 285–301; Mommsen, Staatsrecht 3, 1017; Teuffel–Schwabe 216. 2; G. Boissier, Tacite (English version by W. G. Hutchinson, London 1906), 215–29; V. Le Clerc, Des journaux chez les Romains, Paris 1838; H. Renussen, De diurnis aliisque Romanorum actis, Groningen 1857. See also the items registered above in note 1.

[5] Though J. C. Rolfe's Loeb version renders it «Caesar's very first enactment after

it is a moot point as to whether or not *acta populi* had existed in any form before 59.[6]

At first blush, the answer would seem to be, no. For the very good reason that not one of our sources adduces the *acta* in so many words for any event prior to 59. This is particularly striking in the case of the dozen or so Ciceronian references: his earliest allusions occur in letters written to Atticus in 58.

A lone passage may provoke some disquiet. The elder Pliny, as will be seen, included the *acta* in his bibliographies, and several times cites them for the curious information contained in his ‹Natural History›. A very typical sample is the item concerning a rain of bricks in the year of Milo's death (2, 147). This wondrous event *in acta eius anni relatum est*. The year, of course, is 48, and so causes no problems. However, at the beginning of the very same section, a similar prodigy (a rain of milk admixed with blood) in the consulship of M'. Acilius and C. Porcius *relatum in monumenta est*. The year in question is 114. Hence, if this means «in the records», as the Loeb translator has it,[7] the conclusion would have to be that *acta* of some sort were published before the consulship of Julius Caesar.

Relatum est in both passages catches the eye. And any dictionary will disclose that *monumentum* is frequently used of written documents. However, the only other passage containing this noun ever taken by scholars[8] to refer to the *acta* is in, of all places, the ‹Historia Augusta› (Comm. 11, 5): *ludum semper ingressus est et, quotiens ingrederetur, publicis monumentis indi iussit*. It is well worth observing that, shortly afterwards (Comm. 15, 4), the biographer follows up with a reference to *actis urbis*, with the same attendant phraseology (*indi iuberet*) as before.

This phenomenon may be instructive for the methods of that egregious biographer. In neither author, however, must *monumenta* ineluctably refer to *acta*. A prodigy from the heavens and the posturings of a megalomaniac *princeps* could equally have been deemed worthy of commemoration in special inscriptions. The Plinian item might have appeared to Julius Caesar to be precisely the sort of thing his *acta diurna* could and should subsume. After all, he was also the *pontifex maximus*. And, as a politician, he will have found it useful to publish favourable prodigies to counter the doleful prognostications of Bibulus[9] in 59.

Caesar may have regularised and expanded what had hitherto appeared occasionally and in more restricted physical form. The real issue, indeed, may not be the publication of the *acta diurna* but that of the *acta senatus*. Analysis of the Sue-

---

becoming . . .» and Robert Graves' Penguin translation follows suit («Caesar's first act as consul»). Cf. H. Ailloud's Budé version («établit le premier . . .»).

[6] Hübner, followed by Humbert and others, denied that there had been any before 59, against Becker–Marquardt, Handbuch der römisch. Alterthümer, Leipzig 1851, 1, 39.

[7] Cf. the version «consignés dans les documents» of J. Beaujeu's Budé.

[8] Humbert and Kubitschek, for instance, adduce it for the *acta publica*; by contrast, it is omitted from the register of passages in the TLL.

[9] Suetonius, JC 20, 1: *domo abditus nihil aliud quam per edicta obnuntiaret.*

tonian word order is instructive. The biographer wrote *tam senatus quam populi diurna acta*. In all other plain *tam/quam* sequences in the ‹De Vita Caesarum›, the more important item of the two invariably goes with *tam*.[10]

On this reckoning, it was Caesar's prime concern to have senatorial business made public. Which makes very good political sense. His consulship was that of a populist;[11] he will certainly have wanted the voters to know which nobles were opposed to popular measures. Moreover, transcription and publication of the senate's business could be represented as a reasonable and logical extension of the established practice of the recording and occasional publication of senatorial decrees.

We are compelled to such conjectures because of Suetonius' failure to offer any explanation for Caesar's policy. However, the notion that it was the senatorial *acta* that were more to the political point is nourished by the fact that it was these, and not the gazette, that Augustus thought it prudent to suppress. The consequences of this policy, on which Suetonius is again silent as to motive (Aug. 36), for imperial propaganda and the *acta diurna* will be examined in due course.

What exactly does *populi diurna acta* imply? There are those[12] who restrict the scope to transactions of the Assemblies or courts. That might possibly have been the original intent. But if so, then it is surely odd that Cicero never adduces them in a speech: all the extant references are contained in his letters.

Possibly he considered their content alien to the dignity of his oratory, an attitude later paralleled by the scorn evinced (when it suited him) by Tacitus (ann. 13, 31, 3). Yet one doubts that Cicero maintained a consistent policy. If the *acta* of his day were as varied as they could be in the imperial period, then their contents would have been ideal for his more knockabout attacks on individuals.

When talking of *acta diurna*, it must be borne in mind that we are not absolutely certain that this was always the case. Apart from the Suetonian passage on Caesar's publication, the only references to a daily gazette are imperial in date: one in the biographer (Claud. 41, 3), two in Tacitus (ann. 13, 31, 3; 16, 22, 6). Elsewhere, they are referred to in a variety of ways; whether or not the inconsistency betokens anything, we shall consider later. The same holds good of Dio Cassius, apparently the only Greek source to mention the gazette. Dio never alludes to a daily publication. It is possible, then, that the frequency with which the *acta* appeared was variable; the descriptive *diurna* in Suetonius' account of Julius Caesar's publication could be anachronistic.

---

[10] JC 24, 3; 74, 2; Aug. 66, 4; Tib. 13, 2; 59, 1; Claud. 1, 5; Galba 3, 2; Dom. 2, 2; 20. These statistics are based on the ‹Index Verborum› to Suetonius compiled by A. A. Howard and C. N. Jackson (Harvard 1922).

[11] Suetonius, JC 20, 3: *cetera item, quae cuique libuissent, dilargitus est contra dicente nullo aut, si conaretur quis, absterrito ...*

[12] Michael Grant, for example, takes Suetonius as referring to decrees of the Assembly in his Julius Caesar, London 1969, 83; Robert Graves' Penguin version is «proceedings of the People's Court».

This is an appropriate cue to turn to the evidence of Cicero as to the nature of the *acta* of his day. As earlier remarked, the allusions are confined to his correspondence. Their range is as follows:

Ad Att. 3, 8, 3 (May 29, 58); 3, 10, 1 (June 17, 58); 3, 15, 6 (August 17, 58); 6, 2, 6 (April ?, 50). Ad fam. 2, 15, 5 (August, 50); 9, 16, 4 (July, 46); 10, 1, 2 (September, 44); 12, 23, 2 (October, 44); 10, 28, 3 (February, 43); 12, 28, 3 (March, 43); 11, 25, 1 (June 18, 43); 12, 8, 1 (June, 43).

It must be admitted that only twice does Cicero's language undeniably indicate the gazette: ad Att. 6, 2, 6: *acta urbana*; ad fam. 12, 23, 2: *rerum urbanarum acta.* A third passage is comparable: ad fam. 10, 28, 3: *res urbanas actaque omnia.* Otherwise, the references are all simply to plain *acta.* In some cases, ambiguity results. For instance, the phrase *acta quae essent usque ad VIII Kal. Jun.* (ad Att. 3, 10, 1) might simply mean ‹events up to May 25› (cf. ad fam. 12, 28, 3 for a similar example). For the most part, however, all the foregoing passages from Cicero have been taken to refer to the gazette and, given the improbability of plain *acta* referring to the *acta senatus*, it is legitimate to analyse them in this light.[13]

The letters written to Atticus in 58 indicate that Caesar's policy for the publication of the gazette had been duly implemented. It is, of course, natural that Cicero's earliest references to the *acta* should turn up in letters written in the course of his exile. From the chronologies, it is clear that Atticus' letters and packages of news were reaching the orator in Thessalonica with fair speed.

In one case (ad Att. 3, 15, 6), Cicero is expecting the gazette of August 1. Otherwise, he is seen waiting for the *acta mensis Mai* (ad. Att. 3, 8, 3) or those up to May 25 (ad Att. 3, 10, 1). Frequency of publication is unclear. Was Cicero waiting for the entire collection of issues for the month of May to come in one big parcel? Or a single issue covering the whole month? Or a digest of the month made for him by Atticus?

Although it does not necessarily imply daily publication, the reference to the issue of August 1 shows that the *acta* carried a specific day's date. From the orator's own comments, it is clear that he regarded their content as reliable enough to condition his own actions. On the basis of what will prove to be in the awaited issue of August 1, *statuam in tuosne agros confugiam.* A little earlier, he had accepted Atticus' judgement of their worth: *suades ne longius discedamus dum acta mensis Mai ad nos perferantur.*

Some years later, when Cicero was away from Rome as a governor rather than an exile, he was less inclined to rely on the *acta* for vital news. A famous letter of M. Caelius Rufus (ad fam. 8, 1) discloses that he had promised *me omnes res urbanas diligentissime tibi perscripturum*; Caelius has his *operarii* (scribes or reporters?) to prepare accounts so detailed *ut verear ne tibi nimium arguta haec sedulitas*

---

[13] Cf. Shackleton Bailey on ad Att. 3, 8, 3.

videatur; all this is to be further supplemented by Caelius' own letters, and by packages of *senatusconsulta, edicta, fabulae, rumores.*

A provincial governor, of course, was in a more privileged position for receiving news from home than a political exile. Hence the point is of limited cogency. Nevertheless, it might indicate that Cicero in 50 felt the gazette less vital to him than he had in 58.

But there is no warrant for being narrowly schematic. The quality of a newspaper can ebb and flow. In several of the relevant letters written after the Ides of March, Cicero regards the reports of the *acta* to be sufficiently detailed to absolve him from the need to attach long letters. Ad fam. 12, 23, 2 (to Cornificius) is typical: *rerum urbanarum acta tibi mitti certo scio. Quod ni ita putarem, ipse perscriberem, in primisque Caesaris Octaviani conatum* (cf. ad fam. 10, 1, 2; 11, 25, 1; 12, 28, 3 for similar expressions).

This allusion to the attempt on Antony's life implies that the *acta* contained ‹front page headlines›, with sensational news (*fictum* in this case, Cicero alleges) and the naming of prominent names. Furthermore, if Cicero's scathing words to Cassius, *scelus affinis tui Lepidi summamque levitatem et inconstantiam ex actis, quae ad te mitti certo scio . . .* (ad fam. 12, 8, 1), owe anything to the news, it is clear that the gazette did not always mince its words.

The *acta*, then, contained serious news, reported in considerable detail. And prominent Romans might well expect to find their names there, in favourable or unfavourable stories. To the foregoing examples can be added an account of the political *constantia* of Curio (ad Att. 6, 2, 6), and Cicero's complaint to Caelius (ad fam. 2, 15, 5) to the effect that *De Ocella parum ad me plane scripseras, et in actis non erat.* This relates to that versatile adulterer, Servius Ocella, who, according to a subsequent letter from Caelius (ad fam. 8, 7, 2), *nemini persuasisset se moechum esse nisi triduo bis deprehensus esset.* Clearly, Cicero expected to read about this sort of adventure in the gazette of his day.[14]

Six references in the commentaries of Asconius Pedianus[15] supplement our knowledge of the gazette in Cicero's day. It may or may not be significant that these allusions (which invariably adduce plain *acta*) are restricted to two commentaries: one in the ‹In Scaurianam›, five in the ‹In Milonianam›. Asconius consulted the gazette mainly for precise dates of such events as the impeachment of Scaurus (19, 4) or the issuing of a *senatus consultum* (44, 9). He also went to the *acta* for names: they identify a freedman who led the siege of Pompey's house (46, 26), and a

---

[14] An indication of the lighter side of the *acta* in Cicero's time. The episode of Ocella is nicely reminiscent of, say, the ‹This England› column in the ‹New Statesman›. Caelius well appreciated the pleasure occasioned by this sort of thing, especially for expatriate readers: *scio quam omnibus peregrinantibus gratum sit, minimarum quoque rerum quae domi gerantur, fieri certiores* (ad fam. 8, 1, 1).

[15] References to Asconius are by page and line of the OCT of A. C. Clark.

couple of speakers at an Assembly debate (49, 7). On one occasion (44, 9), the *acta* disappoint him; they furnish a date, but further investigation elicited the comment

It is to be remarked that Asconius evinces none of the disdain for the gazette *ultra relatum in actis illo die nihil.*

manifested on occasion by Tacitus and others. On the contrary, he emphasises his reliance on it: *sed ego, ut curiosius aetati vestrae satisfaciam, acta etiam totius illius temporis persecutus sum* (44, 9).[16] And when the *acta* and a speech of Cicero corroborate each other, that is reason enough to reject the rival view of the scholar Fenestella: *acta etenim magis sequenda et ipsam orationem quae actis congruit puto quam Fenestellam qui . . .* (31, 13). All in all, Asconius is the primary source most consistently confident in the quality of information provided by the gazette.

Suetonius, as earlier observed, offers no reason for Julius Caesar's concern with the publication of *acta*. The motives are, of course, obvious enough. Dio Cassius confirms what has already been said about them in this paper. In his earliest surviving reference to the *acta* (44, 11, 3),[17] the historian notes that Caesar caused his refusal of the title of King to be inserted into the gazette. This sets a predictable precedent many emperors were only too pleased to follow.

Suetonius tells us quite neutrally (Aug. 36) that Augustus forbade the publication of the *acta senatus*. Exactly when he made this enactment is unclear. The biographer shoves the item in at the head of a list of regulations governing various magistrates and commissions. His policy appears to have been maintained by successive rulers; at any rate, no emperor is said by Suetonius to have reversed the Augustan ban. A letter of Fronto implies that the policy obtained in the Antonine period: *hunc, nisi ita laudo ut laudatio mea non in actis senatus abstrusa lateat, sed in manibus oculisque versetur . . .* (ad M. Caes. II = VAN DEN HOUT, p. 24). It may be subjoined that the ‹Historia Augusta› credits no later *princeps* with any change of policy.

Augustus, however, did not suppress the gazette. And this policy also seems to have been followed by the emperors in general. Either they thought it essentially too trivial and apolitical to be worth banning or – what is much more likely – they were confident of being able to control its content. The various imperial interventions recorded by the sources will presently justify this view.

Some emperors allowed items from the *acta senatus* to appear in the gazette. The paucity of sources may distort, but this seems particularly true of Trajan. It is not, of course, very surprising that Pliny should claim in the ‹Panegyricus› (75, 1) that he could not hope to cover all the senatorial acclamations and the like which that

---

[16] Cf. 44, 9; 47, 1, for the emphatic *cognovi* of his researches into the *acta*. The phrase *acta enim totius illius temporis* at 44, 9 may confirm MANUTIUS' supplement *temporis* after *acta* at 47, 1 rather than BAITER's *anni*. As we saw in the case of Cicero, Asconius tends to refer to *acta* for a particular period rather than dated issues of a particular day.

[17] Not 47, 11, 3, as HUMBERT and the RE notice.

body wished *in publica acta mittenda*. More to the point is the concomitant remark that before Trajan, *acclamationes quidem nostrae parietibus curiae claudebantur*.

An odd disclosure, that. One would have expected the ‹bad› emperors at least to have wished the public at large to read of the eulogies bestowed on them in the senate. This Plinian revelation ought also to be kept in mind by students of the ‹Historia Augusta› when assessing the worth of such texts offered by that notorious compilation.[18]

To what extent Augustus sanctioned publication of the *acta senatus* in the gazette is uncertain. Probably not much, to judge by the sources. As Octavian, in 38 B. C., he had attended to the public acknowledgement of the birth of Drusus, the brother of Tiberius.[19] However, the only item adduced from the gazette for the entire reign of Augustus by any source is an innocuous one concerning a freedman's exceptionally large family. We owe this to the elder Pliny, who unearthed it *in actis temporum divi Augusti* (NH 7, 60).

Tiberius, typically, took great pains to ensure that the senatorial record reflected what he wished it to. A duly sinister note is provided by Tacitus, writing of the year 29: *fuit in senatu Junius Rusticus, componendis patrum actis delectus a Caesare, eoque meditationes eius introspicere creditus* (ann. 5, 4). This may very well be the origin of the *curator actorum senatus* or *ab actis senatus*.[20] The emperor evidently made sure that the record was drawn up by a reliable man. In a later age, it is instructive to note, Trajan enjoyed the services of just such an individual: the *acta senatus* in his reign were, for a season, superintended by no less a person than the future emperor Hadrian (HA, Hadr. 3, 2).

After making due allowance for the limited and therefore almost certainly distorting nature of the sources, collation of the surviving items will afford at least a glimpse of what was not allowed to appear in the gazette under individual emperors. Suetonius adduces it only four times. Twice (Tib. 5; Cal. 8, 2), it is in pursuit of his most carefully paraded research interest, the establishing of the precise birthplace of an emperor. As in the case of Asconius, Suetonius will use the evidence of the gazette against a rival literary source. A third passage (Cal. 36, 2) notes that Caligula had statements of divorce filed and *in acta referri*. Along with this should be noted the contemptuous remark of Seneca in Nero's time to the effect that *nulla sine divortio acta sunt* (de ben. 3, 16, 2). Finally, Suetonius records examples of Claudius' new-fangled alphabet *in plerisque libris ac diurnis titulisque operum* (Claud. 41, 3).

The overall infrequency of references in Suetonius should be noted; they are

---

[18] See later for these.

[19] Dio 48, 44, 3; assuming, that is, that τὰ ὑπομνήματα are equivalent to *acta* here. If so (and it is the only noun Dio uses elsewhere of the gazette), then the Loeb translation is palpably wrong in rendering it as «his memoranda».

[20] See Furneaux, ad loc.

adduced only for three reigns, and there is nothing after Claudius. Does this betoken (among other possibilities) the relative absence of scandal from the gazette? If so, then comparisons with modern tabloids need to be restrained.

The situation is similar in the extant narratives of Dio Cassius. As earlier mentioned, he is apparently the only Greek source to adduce the *acta diurna*. Given the usual Greek unfamiliarity with Latin, this is a point of uncertain significance, although the failure of Plutarch to make use of them is striking.[21] In addition to the two passages already cited, there are a further five allusions in Dio to the gazette; three concern the reign of Tiberius. Two (one perhaps a doublet?) mention the recording of public greetings of dignitaries on the part of Livia (57, 12, 2) and Agrippina (60, 33, 1). To influence public opinion in his direction with regard to certain *maiestas* trials, the shrewd Tiberius had remarks defamatory to himself made by the defendants published in the *acta* (57, 23, 2). In another area of life, the emperor forbade publication of the name of the architect who corrected a lean to Rome's largest portico (57, 21, 5). This item should be set alongside the complaint of Tacitus that imperial buildings are a subject for the gazette rather than for historians. The alleged motive for Tiberius' action is jealousy.

Finally, Dio records (67, 11, 3) that Domitian tried to conceal the number of his victims by not allowing their names to be published in the gazette. Which smacks of the techniques of suppression employed in Orwell's ‹1984›. It is clear that the effort, if made, was far from successful; Suetonius (Dom. 10, 2, 2–4) has no trouble compiling a select register.[22] And it might be thought improbable that Domitian would depart so far from the example of his model Tiberius' technique (earlier discussed) of trying to win public support for his condemnations by disseminating select details.

Dio does not adduce the *acta* for any reign after that of Domitian. This is something else pertinent to analysis of the ‹Historia Augusta›, since all but one of the latter's allusions to the gazette bear on reigns covered by Dio. Not that any firm conclusion can be drawn, given the condition of Dio's text; but it remains a suggestive statistic.

As with Suetonius and Dio Cassius, so with Tacitus. The Roman historian's

---

[21] Given that a Greek might apply to Roman friends or patrons for a translation. On Plutarch in this regard, see C. P. Jones, Plutarch and Rome, Oxford 1971, 81–7. Plutarch may, of course, have adduced the gazette in his lost imperial *vitae*, albeit there is no sign of them in the ‹Galba› and ‹Otho›.

[22] The matter has a bearing on Tacitus, Agric. 2, 1: *legimus* ... (the impeachments of Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio). Ogilvie–Richmond take this to allude to the *acta senatus* or *acta diurna* (either way, this could have implications for provincial distribution, since Tacitus may have been away from Rome at the time), adding that Domitian, according to Dio, «sometimes» suppressed the names. It should be emphasised that there is no equivalent to «sometimes» in Dio's Greek.

formal use of the gazette is infrequent, and strikingly limited in scope. Four items only, all from the ‹Annals›: why none in the ‹Histories›?[23]

Too much should not be made of the scornful comment in ann. 13, 31, 1: *pauca memoria digna evenere, nisi cui libeat laudandis fundamentis et trabibus . . . volumina implere, cum ex dignitate populi Romani repertum sit res inlustris annalibus, talia diurnis urbis actis mandare.* Cornelius Tacitus knew that there was more to the gazette than this. When researching an item concerning the mother of Germanicus, he notes (ann. 3, 3, 4) without distinction or prejudice that *non apud auctores rerum, non diurna actorum scriptura reperio.* The desire to insert a disquisition on the evolution of the city limits prompts him to note, by way of concluding the subject, that the Claudian limits were recorded *publicis actis* (ann. 12, 24, 11).

Above all, there is the speech of Cossutianus Capito attacking Thrasea, in the course of which he is made to denounce that Stoic for ‹headline hunting›: *diurna populi Romani per provincias per exercitus curatius leguntur, ut noscatur quid Thrasea non fecerit* (ann. 16, 22, 6).[24] It should be noted that this does not imply that the gazette was being devoured for its *acta senatus* extracts; according to Capito (16, 22, 1), Thrasea had not been in the House for three years.

The younger Pliny was alive to the pleasures and utility of the gazette.[25] He had perhaps been steered in this directly by the example of his uncle. The desire to publicise himself will have been another factor. The aforementioned passage from the ‹Panegyricus› can here be recalled. Pliny is evidence for the verbatim transcription of an imperial decree in the gazette: *liber principis severus et tamen moderatus: leges ipsum; est in publicis actis* (ep. 5, 13, 8). This same avenue offered for functionaries. Hence, another letter (7, 33, 3), giving the ‹inside story› of Pliny's involvement in the prosecution of Baebius Massa, although it was something that had appeared *in publicis actis.*

Syme[26] (amongst others) took this allusion to indicate the existence of *acta publica* different both from those of the senate and the gazette. There is no warrant for this complicating notion. The sources refer indifferently to plain *acta, acta diurna, acta urbana, acta populi* (with or without the addition of *Romani*), and *acta publi-*

---

[23] See later for the possible relevance of Pliny, ep. 7, 33, 3, to this question.

[24] Because of the unusual omission of the noun *acta*, this passage can be overlooked; it does not appear under this rubric in, e.g., the TLL or in Gerber–Greef–John, Lexicon Taciteum.

[25] In ep. 9, 15, 3 (written to Pompeius Falco from his Tuscan estate), Pliny signs off with this request: *tu consuetudinem serva, nobisque sic rusticis urbana acta perscribe.* This is commonly taken to allude to the gazette (Sherwin–White takes it thus), but it might refer only to Falco's epistolary habits. We noticed this ambiguity in some of Cicero's letters. A significant point, since Pliny is waxing Ciceronian here (the orator uses *perscribere* at least three times in identical contexts) and may be imagining himself back in the Republic awaiting vital news from Rome.

[26] Tacitus, Oxford 1958, 120 n. 2.

ca.[27] The adjective *publica* is surely a natural equivalent to *populi.*[28] Nor is it the case that these latter phraseologies are restricted to loftier items; the elder Pliny (NH 8, 145) has an affecting story of a loyal dog that he says was *actis populi Romani testatum.*

There is something else of consequence about the present letter of Pliny. The recipient is none other than Cornelius Tacitus himself! He is assured in the opening sentence that *historias tuas immortales futuras.* Thus, when Pliny goes on to say, *demonstro ergo quamquam diligentiam tuam fugere non possit, cum sit in publicis actis,* could it be a combination of gentle hint and sarcasm through which the historian is urged not to neglect the gazette as a valid and important source? That is perhaps a nice thought.

Whether the elder Pliny was wont to adduce the *acta diurna* in his lost historical narratives, we naturally cannot tell. The bibliographies to Books 7, 8, and 10 of his ‹Natural History› include bald references to *acta,* shoved in amidst literary authorities without distinction or amplification.[29] In the text itself, *acta* are cited on five occasions. Three of these items were earlier discussed: the rain of bricks, a loyal dog, and the polyphiloprogenitive *libertus.* Of the remaining two, one concerns a sporting fan's suicide at the cremation of Felix, the Red charioteer (7, 186); the other records the epiphany of a phoenix in A. D. 37 (10, 5).

The sporting notice reminds one of the suggestion of FRIEDLÄNDER[30] that the *acta* may have contained news of chariot races. A plausible notion, and one that could easily be extended to arena affairs. Nevertheless, no source can be produced to support it. Two passages might possibly militate against the idea. Juvenal gets news of a Green victory in Rome, not from the gazette, but from the noise of the crowd (11, 198). An enterprising owner of chariots, one Caecina, sent news of his victories to friends by carrier swallows, each one *inlito victoriae colore* (Pliny, NH 10, 71).

All three Plinian volumes for which the *acta* are cited as a source are devoted to curious lore and prodigies. This may seem to imply that such must have been the basic content of many issues of the gazette. Indeed, this could have been the case. Yet that does not mean that the *acta* were unremittingly tabloid in content. After all, one does find odd items in the best modern newspapers, and they are quite properly there. Nor is it to be forgotten that what may seem silly or trivial to ourselves did not always seem so to the ancients.

---

[27] Similarly, Dio Cassius usually employs the plain noun ὑπομνήματα, but he once adorns it with the epithet δημόσια (57, 12, 2), and once with κοινά (57, 23, 2), with no obvious distinction as to the nature of the subject matter.

[28] A point made by SHERWIN-WHITE in his Commentary on ep. 5, 13, 8.

[29] A number of the compilations of references adduced throughout this paper register only the bibliography to Book 8.

[30] Sittengeschichte I[5], 290.

Pliny's mention of the phoenix is an example. Tacitus (ann. 6, 28) does not disdain a lengthy disquisition on the topic, and reports without sarcasm that the bird's advent *praebuit materiem doctissimis indigenarum et Graecorum multa super eo miraculo disserendi.*[31] He does not adduce the gazette for the item, nor does it look as though he needed to. For all that, the item may alert us to the possibility that writers exploited the *acta* more than they care to admit.

This can hardly be demonstrated, but at the very least it can be said that very similar things are to be seen in the gazette and in literature. To give a single example, Pliny's collection of canine anecdotes, for one of which the *acta* are adduced, recalls the Suetonian tale of a prophetic visit by a dog to the breakfast table of Vespasian (Vesp. 5, 4).

In the ‹Satyricon› of Petronius (53, 1–10), a clerk inflicts on the gathering a recital of events on Trimalchio's estates *tanquam urbis acta*. The passage is generally taken to be an indication of the nature of the real thing.[32] Perhaps so; but one must be careful. Is it direct parody, or parody by inversion? That is to say, does Petronius amass items very similar to the ones commonly featured in the gazette, or are his examples very dissimilar for the purpose of reverse humour? From what we know of the *acta diurna*, one or two of the Petronian episodes are redolent of the real thing, namely the announcements of births and divorce.

Another satirist who found the *acta* a convenient point of reference was Juvenal. There are three almost certain references, and a more debatable fourth. Thanks largely (one supposes) to the fact (in itself perhaps suggestive) that three of the four occur in the so-called obscene Satires 2, 6, and 9, they tend to get omitted from the compilations of references.[33]

Of homosexual nuptials, Juvenal observes: *fient ista palam, cupient et in acta referri* (2, 136). When Virro wishes to publicise his virility by advertising the names of his offspring, he is told: *tollis enim et libris actorum spargere gaudes* (9, 84). Births, at least prominent ones, were a regular feature of the gazette. So were divorces, in which case we can imagine that marriages also appeared there. At 7, 104, the satirist asks acidly *quis dabit historico quantum daret acta legenti?* Perhaps a tribute to the popularity of the gazette, the line recalls the aforementioned distinction drawn (when it was to his purpose) by Tacitus between historiography and journalism. It may be that the comparison was by now something of a rhetorical *topos*.

A sequence depicting what cruel mistresses do whilst their maid is being whipped contains the line *et caedit, longi relegit transversa diurni* (6, 483). Friedländer followed the scholiast in explaining the *diurni* as referring to the *ratiocinium*

---

[31] Pliny and Dio (58, 27, 1) date the appearance to 37, whereas the Tacitean notice is under the year 34.

[32] Cf. K. F. C. Rose, Trimalchio's Accountant, CP 62, 1967, 258–9.

[33] For instance, from the TLL and the RE notice.

diurnum or household accounts.[34] But this does not fit the character of the lady in the least. The concomitant examples of her behaviour involve her facial toilet, the consideration of what to wear, and gossip with friends. She is not the sort of mistress who gives up her time to domestic accounts. Indeed, she will presently be vilipended for not watching the budget: *nulla viri cura interea nec mentio fiet / damnorum . . . gravis est rationibus* (6, 508–11).

If Juvenal is here alluding to the gazette, then we have a precious notice of its physical format. It was of some size[35] (*longi*), and was written right across the page or board (a format suggesting a series of headlines and captions?) rather than in columns (*transversa*).[36]

Otherwise, we know from Suetonius that the gazette employed the alphabetic innovations of Claudius for a time. As to the literary style of the thing, Quintilian (9, 3, 18) mentions that the idiom *saucius pectus* was *iam vulgatum actis*. Since the comment crops up in a discussion of Graecisms in Roman literature, it must reflect the style of the *acta*, not a piece of bad grammar (*saucius for saucium*). This may well be the most fascinating glimpse we have of the reportage of the *acta diurna*.[37]

Two other references can be fitted in here. A passage in Valerius Maximus (2, 9, 3) indicates that cases of personal luxury and sumptuary legislation were fodder for the gazette. Seneca, apart from his comment on the number of divorces in them, once boasts that *beneficium in acta non mitto* (de ben. 2, 10, 4). This might hint at some well-publicised private charities on the part of certain individuals. Yet that is not a necessary inference; it could be taken as a natural and colloquial expression along the lines of our own ‹shout it from the rooftops›.

The ‹Historia Augusta› (alas!) cannot be left out of the picture. Especially as it offers what, if taken as genuine, would be the unique verbatim extract from the *acta*. Only one of the alleged sextet of biographers affects to have consulted the gazette regularly. That is ‹Vopiscus›, when ushering in his ‹Life of Probus›. Both *acta senatus* and *acta diurna* are laid claim to, along with such bibliographical gems as the volumes of the Ulpian Library, the *regesta* of the scribes of the Porphyry Portico, and the *ephemeris* of that universal favourite, Turdulus Gallicanus (Probus 2, 1). As a genuine source, the gazette is here condemned by the company it

---

[34] See later for the possible significance of the regular failure of Juvenal's scholiasts to see *acta* as alluding to the gazette.

[35] This would be congruent with the passages earlier adduced from Cicero which implied considerable detail on the part of the *acta*.

[36] On this, see Duff's note (adducing Suetonius, JC 56, 6). Presumably, we are to imagine the lady as going out to see the gazette posted up in the city; a copy intended for private use would surely have been made in neater and more economical columnar form.

[37] And perhaps a further reason for believing that the preceding passage of Juvenal *does* allude to the gazette; the sort of story conjured up by the phrase *saucius pectus* will surely have appealed to the lady in question.

keeps. And it is almost superfluous to observe that the *acta* are never actually invoked for a specific item.

There are four passages in the HA in which the gazette is featured. These references are, it should be noted, very much a speciality of ‹Lampridius›, who claims three of them. At Diadumenianus 6, 7, it is asserted that Commodus was enrolled as Antoninus on the day of his birth by Marcus Aurelius who *in publicas edidit*.[38] We have seen in better sources that this was the sort of thing regularly inserted into the gazette. The present notice, however, attracts suspicion from the mere fact that it occurs in a sequence on the *nomen Antoninorum*, one of the HA's more notorious obsessions.[39] Further disquiet accrues from a cognate notice in Gord. 4, 8, where ‹Capitolinus› serves up the palpable fiction that Gordian thus named his progeny *publicis actis*.

‹Lampridius› ascribes to Marius Maximus the claim that Commodus *omnia quae turpiter, quae impure, quae crudeliter, quae gladiatorie, quae lenonie faceret, actis indi iuberet* (Comm. 15, 4). One detail of this could be credited: Commodus may well have publicised his feats in the arena. Otherwise, it looks very much like a parody masquerading as fact, somewhat reminiscent of the Petronian burlesque of the *acta urbis*. Without claiming that the biographer is directly influenced by Petronius, it can be remarked that *acta urbis* is the formula used in both cases.

In the highly fictional ‹Life of Alexander Severus› (6, 2–5), Lampridius produces a detailed and verbatim account of a meeting of the senate *ex actis urbis*. It is replete with (indeed, there is nothing else!) the alleged acclamations of the senators in praise of Alexander and in damnation of Elagabalus. To the extent that the gazette did feature extracts from the *acta senatus*, the item comports some initial plausibility.

But the extract does not survive scrutiny. The HA is forever parading such detailed accounts of senatorial acclamations.[40] None are likely to be genuine, in the form given. Their ritual, iterative style belongs to a later age. It is perfectly exemplified in the sole (genuine, that is) surviving text of the minutes of a meeting of the senate, namely that prefixed to the ‹Codex Theodosianus› in the year 438.[41]

The suspicion that our biographer claims the support of the gazette merely as a variant on his method of rehashing a favourite fiction is enhanced by a subsequent passage (56, 2–10) in the same *vita*. Here more acclamations turn up, in what

---

[38] Given the uniqueness (in context) of the phrase *in publicas*, this passage cannot be taken as a clear-cut reference. Hübner was determined that it is, and so altered the *in publicas* of the manuscripts to *in publica acta*.

[39] Cf. Syme, Emperors and Biography, Oxford 1971, 78–88.

[40] Apart from those in the AS see AC 13, 1–5; Comm. 18–19; Maxim. 16, 3–7, 26; Gord. 11, 9–10; Max.-Balb. 2, 9–12.

[41] On this, see T. S. Davidson, A problem of Senate procedure in the later Roman Empire, AJP 67, 1946, 168–83.

purports to be a direct transcription *ex actis senatus*. The odds against the HA being the genuine respository of both the only extant specimen of the *acta diurna* and *acta senatus* do not bear thinking about!

Most of the work done on the *acta diurna* belongs to the age of innocence, that is prior to 1889 and the publication of DESSAU's classic argument for the single authorship of the HA. Hence the general tendency to conclude assemblages of references with the aforementioned passage in the Probus and the suggestion that the *acta* did not survive (at any rate, not for long) the transference of power to Constantinople.

In point of fact, the HA, if taken at face value, would only be evidence for two things: the *acta* were alive in the lifetime of Probus, and were available to biographers supposedly writing under Diocletian and Constantine. Nowadays, few people are inclined to accept the advertised date of the dubious sextet. But even on the older reckoning, there was more to be said.

It would not be hard to imagine the suppression of the gazette, at least in its traditional form, by Diocletian, say, or one of the early Christian emperors. And yet, one would have thought it a useful way of publicising vital policy, especially the persecution of the Christians under Diocletian and its converse under Constantine and company. In short, it may not be a logical assumption that the gazette would have fizzled out soon after 330.

In a passage ignored by virtually all studies of the *acta*,[42] Ammianus Marcellinus describes the purging of the adherents of Constantius by Julian. One illustrious victim of the commission of Chalcedon was the ex-prefect and consul, Flavius Taurus. According to Ammianus (22, 3, 4), *acta super eo gesta non sine magno legebantur horrore, cum id voluminis publici contineret exemplum: consulatu Tauri et Florenti inducto sub praeconibus Tauro.* It is possible that *voluminis publici* is the historian's idiom for the gazette, partly occasioned by a desire to avoid repetition of *acta* in two senses in this same sentence.

This is not an unimpeachable reference. It might only connote a special edict or proclamation, issued to justify what was done to Taurus. Still, it could relate to the *acta*. If so, it offers a tiny example of the style of reporting.

Two other passages in Ammianus produce similar ambiguity. The historian detected lies on the part of Constantius *in tabulariis principis publicis condita* (16, 12, 70). Later (28, 1, 15), with regard to the series of trials at Rome in 370, Ammianus somewhat defensively claims that *non omnia narratu sunt digna quae per squalidas transiere personas, nec si fieri fuisset necesse, instructiones vel ex ipsis tabulariis suppeterent publicis . . .*

Both items could allude to the gazette. In phraseology and attitude, there is some consonance with earlier times. Reference to *tabulariis principis publicis con-*

---

[42] MAYOR's eagle eye spotted it though; cf. his note on Juvenal 7, 104.

dita is paralleled by, for easy instance, the collective mention of *actis temporum divi Augusti* by the elder Pliny. The suggestion of detail is borne out by comments in Cicero and elsewhere. And the lordly attitude betokened by Ammianus is redolent of that of Tacitus, an effect not likely to be mere coincidence.

These items from Ammianus may extend the history of the *acta diurna* beyond the terminus usually given. However, it cannot be determined just when the gazette disappeared. One ought to acknowledge the possibility that it underwent suppression and revival according to the needs and policies of particular emperors, before finally lapsing.

Boissier,[43] in his highly imaginative essay on the *acta*, asserted that Symmachus must have compiled his epistolary *breviaria* of news with the assistance of the gazette. That does not follow at all: Symmachus presumably had the faculty of memory, and he was well placed to command and receive written *aide-mémoires*.

Two negative items may imply that the gazette was gone by the late fourth or early fifth century at the latest. We earlier saw three allusions to the *acta diurna* in Juvenal, and a possible fourth. In all four cases, the scholiasts offer different interpretations of the meaning of *acta*.[44] This may suggest that the gazette was so remote from their experience that it never occurs to them as an explanation of the word.

Second, and finally, the *acta senatus* attached to the Theodosian Code include chanted demands for copies to be made and kept in the imperial bureaux and government offices. There is no corresponding demand for publication in a gazette. This is also the case with the imperial preface, which sees promulgation in terms of edicts and rescripts only. It may be inferred from all this that by 438 no gazette of the old style existed in either Rome or Constantinople.[45]

---

[43] Op. cit., 222.

[44] Thus, in Juvenal 2, 136, *in acta referri* is explained as *in annalibus contineri*; 7, 104 is interpreted *quantum datur exceptori*; 9, 84 evokes the explanation *id est nominum notitiem divulgare contestione publica*. These scholia seem ultimately to derive from the late fourth or early fifth century; cf. G. Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, Oxford 1954, 185–6.

[45] To what extent, if at all, Constantine equipped his new capital with a gazette in emulation of that of old Rome's is perhaps a good question, easier asked than answered.

LXVIII

RULERS AND RULED AT ROME: AD 14-192

Juvenal asserted that bread and circuses were the sole concerns of the urban populace. A generation later, Fronto refined the sneer into a formulation of imperial policy : *populum Romanum duabus praecipue rebus, annona et spectaculis, teneri* [1]. The theme is stressed by Tacitus : for the *plebs, rei frumentariae angustias* are the *praecipua cura* [2].

It is not surprising to find satirist and historian in agreement. Intellectuals of every outlook tend to sweeping generalisations about the masses. The Marxist no less than the high tory. One mitigating distinction between the Roman writers and their modern counterparts is pertinent. The former were often closer to the realities of life. Tacitus and Pliny spoke in the courts and governed provinces. Philosophers are found addressing the Senate and sometimes calming angry mobs. Sophists appeared before emperors on diplomatic missions and represented their native or adoptive cities in the capital. The ivory tower was a rare refuge for ancient intellectuals. This was a healthy situation, at least in principle. But physical contact is no automatic emollient of feeling. There was no compulsion for intellectuals to profess concern over the lot of the masses; if anyone had to bow to popular feeling, it was the *princeps*. Philosophers might be exiled or executed, but they were not usually lynched by mobs.

Satirists exaggerate as a matter of course. Not that the masses were their only target. The first two victims of *maiestas* trials under Nero were Antistius Sosianus and Fabricius Veiento [3]. Both were aspirant satirists. Antistius lampooned the emperor in verses incautiously recited at a banquet. Veiento made mock of senators and priests; one might have expected Nero to have found these latter pasquinades congenial. Nevertheless, both were exiled : but only for a time. Veiento in particular came back to an illustrious career. He held three consulships and, in spite of his reputation as a *delator*, was still going strong under Nerva.

The *plebs* was the safest and most congenial target for the middle

[1] *Principia Historiae* 17 (= Haines' Loeb, 2. 216).

[2] *Ann.* 15. 36; this *cura* is coupled *voluptatum cupidine.*

[3] *Ann.* 14. 48-50.

and upper class writer. Only for Christians and Cynics was it expedient to adopt popular stances. There was nothing new in the situation. Tacitus indulged himself and his audiences with sneers at the *vulgus* [4]; so had Cicero. In the security of his private correspondence, the orator transmuted the *populus Romanus* into *faex Romuli* or *contionalis hirudo, misera ac ieiuna plebecula* [5]. One can understand his expressed reluctance to dispatch letters to Atticus until he could be sure that the *tabellarius* might be trusted not to open them.

There are variants on the theme. In the *Satyricon*, the atrabilious Ganymede is obsessed with the price of food and corruption in high places. The poor are the victims of both : *aediles male eveniat, qui cum pistoribus colludunt ‚Serva me, servabo te'. Itaque populus minutus laborat; nam isti maiores maxillae semper Saturnalia agunt.* These grumbles come comically from one who was enjoying himself at Trimalchio's ample table. Ganymede rounds off his diatribe with a notable aphorism: *nunc populus est domi leones, foras vulpes* [6]. The people were willing, or constrained, to put up with a great deal.

In refining Juvenal's cliché, Fronto added a percipient qualification : *minus acribus stimulis congiaria quam spectacula expeti; congiariis frumentariam modo plebem singillatim placari ac nominatim, spectaculis universum populum conciliari.* Material aspirations are the monopoly of no social class. All needed to be fed, and most wanted entertainment. Emperors and aristocrats were rarely noted for their asceticism, and men like Seneca cushioned their praise of poverty by a comfortable life style. Julius Caesar had been thought odd for his temperance and indifference to food [7]. Even Antonius Pius died as a consequence of eating too much Alpine cheese [8]. A stingy host and indifferent food were clichés of satire, but it was precisely this deprivation of material pleasures that excited the complainant's spleen. The freeloaders at Trimalchio's table gorge while they covertly sneer. Juvenal professed to be upset over the materialism of Roman society. What really irked him was that the wrong people were enjoying the good things of life. Wealth was rightly coming into the hands of men such as Trimalchio;

[4] See Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (1969), 141 ff., for discussion of the semantic details.

[5] *Ad Att.* 1. 16. 11; 2. 1. 8.

[6] *Sat.* 44.

[7] Suetonius, *JC* 53.

[8] *HA, Pius* 12. 4.

they started from nothing and worked their way up. Juvenal's ergophobic « poor men » were disgusted. They deserve no sympathy.

Concern for the *annona* was legitimate. Why should men starve in the midst of plenty? Tacitus claimed that Nero cancelled his visit to Egypt in 64 to court popularity with the populace; the people feared that the *annona* might be jeopardised in his absence. Unfeelingly, or with grim humour, Tacitus goes on to describe Nero's round of public dinners in Rome. Then came the great fire. According to Dio, one of the emperor's economies after the conflagration was the cancellation of the corn dole [9]. A government that could do that deserved to be faced by riots.

A glance outside the capital confirms the people's position. Apollonius of Tyana found men starving at Aspendos because the rich were hoarding the grain supplies with a view to exporting them at a profit [10]. At Athens, in the second century, the rhetorician-general Lollianus was almost lynched by a hungry crowd. Significantly, he was rescued by the intervention of the Cynic Pancrates, representative of a breed more notorious for its anti-establishment postures [11]. Lollianus was quick to absorb the lesson, perhaps surprisingly so for a professor. When there was no money in the treasury to buy grain from Thessaly, he exacted contributions from his students to meet the cost. That procedure might well be emulated today by radical professors and students who profess fashionable concern for the underprivileged. One of Lollianus' oratorical themes was the issue of Leptines' law and the Athenians' shortage of imported corn. The realities of life could impinge on the literary nostalgia of the Second Sophistic.

And what was wrong in seeking entertainment? It is reasonable to deplore the gladiators, but there was nothing morally upsetting about chariot racing, which is the aspect stressed in the *panem et circenses* sneer. And, as Fronto saw, if the quest for public amusement was wrong, condemnation should not be confined to the masses. Cicero, a fairer critic of society than Tacitus, might refer discreetly to the *plebs perdita*. He was rightly as harsh on the senatorial *piscinarii* [12]. Julio-Claudian emperors, notably Nero,were routinely accused of debasing the principate in their desire to win cheap popularity

[9] Dio, 62. 18. 5; cf. Suetonius, *Nero* 45.

[10] Philostratus, *Vit. Ap.* 1. 15.

[11] Philostratus, *VS* p. 516.

[12] *Ad Att.* 1. 19. 6; 1. 20. 3.

as singers and charioteers. Yet the mob had not approved Drusus' inordinate enthusiasm for the arena [13], and it was the people who were eventually critical of Nero's punishment of the Christians. Their pity was not shared by Tacitus and his class [14].

Artistic pretensions in an emperor were no bad thing. Nero the poet is a more attractive figure than Trajan the philistine [15]. Nor were they restricted to the so-called « bad » emperors. Nearly every *princeps* of the period dabbled in letters. Distinctions were a matter of artistic quality, not morality. The matter provokes a recurrent Tacitean distortion. Nerva was a connoisseur of erotic poetry, so much so that he had won a compliment from Nero [16]. There is no vice in cherishing erotic poetry, but would Tacitus have acknowledged Nerva's artistry in his account of that emperor? Or had it been more laudable for a Vespasian to slumber through the imperial recitals [17]?

For an orator and historian, Tacitus was singular in eschewing literary discussion in his major works. One would not guess at the considerable output of Seneca from the *Annals*, though there was no shortage of relevant contexts for some comment. Yet the arts had long been respectable with the aristocracy. Blanket condemnations require a different commonplace. Mass sentiment is often the conservative one. A singing *princeps* might be easier tolerated by the middle and upper classes than by the populace.

True, there were frequent disturbances over pantomime artists, and the riot at Pompeii in 59 is prototypical of modern soccer encounters. Bread and circuses were not, however, the only preoccupations of the urban mob. In 61, the city prefect Pedanius Secundus was murdered by one of his slaves [18]. The law, not perhaps so ancestral as its supporters were maintaining, prescribed death for all slaves present in the victim's house at the time of the crime. The principle was defended in a brutal speech to the senate by Caius Cassius, and the mass execution was duly carried out. The populace demonstrated against the proposal and the sentence; so much so that soldiers were needed to restore order. Tacitus cannot or will not explain why the mob

[13] *Ann.* 1. 76.
[14] *Ann.* 15. 44.
[15] Dio, 68. 7. 4; Philostratus, *VS* p. 488.
[16] Martial, 8. 70. 7; 9. 26. 9. See R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 1 ff.
[17] Suetonius, *Vespasian* 4.
[18] *Ann.* 14. 42-5.

should suddenly develop a collective sympathy for slaves. It was no unique affair. The perverted Hostius Quadra had been made away with by his slaves, but Augustus intervened to prevent any legal consequences falling on the household [19]. Why? Perhaps he felt that Hostius had got what he deserved. One recalls his attitude to the unpleasant Vedius Pollio [20]. Or did he fear popular tumult? In spite of the Tacitean theory of collective viciousness, mobs can be stirred by crimes with sexual undertones. One motive suggested for the murder of Pedanius was that he had competed with his servile assassin in a homosexual intrigue.

Pliny reports the murder of Larcius Macedo by his slaves; Afranius Dexter was another possible victim [21]. There is no hint that the populace was disturbed by these episodes. Perhaps it rejoiced over the murders of men such as Hostius and Larcius Macedo. Both are condemned for their private lives by Seneca and Pliny. That is striking : both authors owned slaves and had a vested interest in discouraging servile violence.

An explanation for the reaction in 61 might have been found in the character of Pedanius. Or in his office : the city prefecture was not a popular institution [22]. Tacitus is silent. The episode spoiled his theory of mob psychology. Popular outcry over such an issue was not the work of a *vulgus ignavum et nihil ultra verba ausurum* [23]. Neither has he any plaudits for the moderation of Nero, who intervened to veto a supplemental motion which would have extended the punishment to exiling Pedanius' freedmen. One wonders how he felt about his friend Pliny, who proposed the acquittal of the freedmen in the obscurer case of Afranius Dexter. Pliny is coyly proud of his stand; other factions were for exile or execution. Maybe Tacitus favoured the extreme sanction.

In 62, the Tacitean theory is further tarnished by the demonstrations for the hapless Octavia. This time, he felt constrained to produce a formula : *inde crebri questus nec occulti per vulgum, cui minor sapientia et ex mediocritate fortunae pauciora pericula sunt* [24]. The sneer is in

[19] Seneca, *NQ* 1. 16.
[20] Dio, 54, 23. 1.
[21] Pliny, Ep. 3. 14; 8. 14.
[22] *Ann.* 6. 10.
[23] *Hist.* 3. 58.
[24] *Ann.* 14. 60.

poor accord with his account of Thrasea's rallying of the senate to defy Nero in the case of Antistius Sosianus. There, the few obdurate sycophants, including *adulatione promptissimus A. Vitellius*, are marked for censure, and the majority are implicitly commended. But what motivated them? An understandable feeling of savety in numbers : *plures numero tuti*.

Poppaea argued to Nero that the riots for Octavia were staged *a clientelis et servitiis Octaviae quae plebis sibi nomen indiderint* [25]. She could have been right. Spontaneous demonstrations are frequently organised weeks in advance. Street politicians did not die with Clodius and Milo. In 14, the military mutiny in Pannonia had been inspired by a certain Percennius : *dux olim theatralium operarum, dein gregarius miles, procax lingua et miscere coetus histrionali studio doctus* [26]. The American army in Viet Nam currently has its share of Percennius'. The point is, those more laudable (to Tacitus) demonstrations for the house of Germanicus might also have been stage managed. *Rumor* and *fama* are equally manipulable. Tacitus is predictably scornful of most mob gossip, except when it is a question of popular clamour on behalf of Agricola. In that seductive context, even good freedmen can be found; at the court of Domitian, at that [27].

Generalities breed paradox. Had the strictures of Tacitus and Juvenal been absolutely true, the authorities would have slept easier. The behaviour of mobs notoriously defies rational analysis. Crowds are fickle, and they can be used by individuals with ulterior motives. It is probably true that, in any society, the majority of people are politically apathetic. Such apathy cuts across the lines of social class. It was, after all, elevated into a creed by the Epicureans, hardly a proletarian movement. It may be true that the populace surrendered the *comitia* under Tiberius with no reaction other than *inani rumore* [28]. Mass political excitement is difficult to generate and sustain over any period of time. Consummate organisers of opinion such as Trotsky and Mao have found that out. Men are more likely to follow their own interests, especially when protest can only be in the face of physical danger. Normally, the Roman mob would be more concerned with the *annona* than with the fate of slaves or imperial wives. But the evidence

[25] *Ann.* 14. 61.
[26] *Ann.* 1. 16.
[27] *Agr.* 41.
[28] *Ann.* 1. 15.

is clear. The *plebs* was susceptible to other slogans, and to accept the possibility of organised spontaneity is not to invalidate the point.

Nevertheless, the city of Rome was less prone to the politics of riot than many an American city today. The theatres may have been tolerated as accepted focal points for the politics of mass lung power. But the clamours of the arena did not usually spill out into the streets The excited atmosphere of the Colosseum and the Circus Maximus engendered nothing comparable to, say, the *Nika* revolt in Justinian's capital. Juvenal has plenty to say about the nocturnal perils of the streets. Riots are notably omitted from the doleful register of his third Satire.

Physical stability is no proof of well-being. The streets of Moscow are safer than those of New York. The fact says nothing about the relative freedom and happiness of Russians and Americans. In Rome, the *plebs* was unarmed; stones and slogans were unequal to the weapons of the military. The *princeps* was rarely in danger of physical attack from his people. There were exceptional incidents, of course. Suetonius reports an attempt on Claudius : *e plebe homo nocte media iuxta cubiculum eius cum pugione deprehensus est* [29]. How an ordinary citizen could have got so close to the imperial bedroom, unless there were accomplices within the palace, is discreetly unexplained. Similar dangers attended lesser dignitaries; nor were their own slaves the only source of peril. In Tiberius' reign, a governor in Spain was murdered in the countryside *a quodam agresti* [30]. He paid the penalty of being *pace incuriosum*.

The emperors were careful. Tiberius, Claudius, and Nero all concerned themselves with the regulation of *popinae* and the selling of food and drink [31]. As moral or sumptuary measures, these restrictions evoke laughter in the case of the trencherman Claudius and the high-living Nero. The latter, however, is praised for his enactment by Suetonius. These gastronomic constraints were political, and not incompatible with the broader concern for ensuring the *annona*. Autocrats are safer when the masses stay sober. Another commonplace of the imperial biographies is pertinent. Caligula, Nero, Vitellius, Verus, and Commodus all enjoyed the low life of Rome in disguise [32]. The apparent

[29] Suetonius, *Claudius* 13.

[30] *Ann.* 4. 45.

[31] Suetonius, *Tib.* 34, *Cl.* 38, *Nero* 16; Dio, 60. 6. 7.

[32] *Ann.* 13. 25; Suetonius, *Nero* 26; Dio, 61. 8. 1; *HA*, *Verus* 4. 6, *Comm.* 3. 7.

fascination with squalid delights has been common among the European aristocracies; nowadays, it is enjoined upon North American tourists by guide books, and is a moralising cliché in the cinema's concept of decadence. In reality, these discreet imperial ventures into the seamier districts of Rome were inspired by a need to know what the people were saying. Truth on this subject was normally at a discount in court circles. One wonders if any emperor heard the sort of home-truths thrown at Pisistratus and Aristides in similar circumstances.

Because or in spite of all this, a singular statistic stands out. No *princeps* was murdered by a common citizen or lynched by the urban *plebs*. Court intrigues (with or without the praetorians), civil war, and natural death took off all the emperors from Tiberius to Commodus. Domitian might prophetically lament : *condicionem principum miserrimam quibus de coniuratione comperta non crederetur nisi occisis* [33]. No one thought of appealing to the people for assistance in removing an emperor, except such impractical souls as Helvidius Priscus [34]. Nothing was more foolish than the decision of the Pisionan conspirators to assassinate Nero in the Circus. Their scheme had overtones of the Ides of March. One of the group was to approach Nero in the guise of a petitioner, throw him down, and wait hopefully for *tribuni et centuriones et ceterorum, ut quisque audentiae habuisset, adcurrerent trucidarentque* [35].

Piso and company should have studied the murder of Caesar and its aftermath more diligently. The *plebs* was not intoxicated by Greek tales of glorious tyrannicide. Popular reactions to an emperors' violent death was inconvenient for ideologues. The extant portions of the *Annals* do not dwell on any mob joy at the death of Tiberius. That occasions no surprise : the emperor was old, and had long been away from Rome. Positive emotions grow cold at a distance. Suetonius records the delight of the people. How long did it survive the announcement of testamentary largess *plebei Romanae viritim* [36] ? The murder of Caligula provoked no mass support, either for the deed or for the brief senatorial delusion of a restored Republic. The apathy is explained away by the claim that men dared not reveal their true feelings for

[33] Suetonius, *Dom.* 21.

[34] Dio, 65. 12. 2; see R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (1966), 46 ff.

[35] *Ann.* 15. 53.

[36] *Tib.* 76.

fear Caligula was not really dead [37]. There was no rush to announce the decease of Claudius [38]. Nero's death evoked various reactions. The cheers of the *plebs pilleata* in Rome are balanced by the unidentified votaries who kept his memory alive by preserving his tomb and issuing edicts in his name; also by the recurrent pseudo-Nero epiphanies over the next twenty years [39]. A convenient date helped the anti-Nero celebrations : he died on the anniversary of Octavia's death. These meaningless coincidences help to fashion the attitudes of historians : the biographer of Verus had a stroke of luck when he found that maligned emperor shared a birthdate with Nero [40]. Finally, the death of Domitian. The Senate rejoiced, the soldiers grieved, the populace was indifferent [41]. Compare Juvenal : *sed periit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus coeperat* [42]. The comment is absurd; and strikingly inconsistent with the satirist's *panem et circenses* gibe. Did Tacitus indulge in the same incongruous distortion ?

Print and the electronic media have perfected the art (or is it science ?) of image making. Some urge that this is an aspect of the Orwellian 1984 come true. Presidential candidates may be sold to the American public like cigarettes [43]. The difference is that only the latter have to be marked as a health hazard. Similarly, the image of a new emperor was tailored by the more restricted techniques of antiquity.

What had to be promised to whom ? The four immediate successors of Augustus exhibit a pattern. In alternating sequence, the people were presented with two rulers of middle age and two striplings. The masses are commonly assumed to entertain higher hopes of glittering young men. Caligula in particular had the advantage of paternal popularity. Tiberius faced the most difficult situation. He was the first to assume power in a peaceful context. His position was without precedent. It is not to be wondered at that he hesitated in A. D. 14. The Tacitean picture of the dissembling *princeps* has no warrant. Tiberius acted rather like Octavian had done in 27 B.C. The shadow

[37] *Calig.* 60.

[38] Suetonius, *Cl.* 45; Tacitus, *Ann.* 12. 68.

[39] Suetonius, Nero 57.

[40] *HA, Verus* 1. 8; see A. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (1966), 215 ff.

[41] Suetonius, *Dom.* 23.

[42] *Sat.* 4. 153-4.

[43] See J. McGinniss, *The Selling of the President* 1968 (1969).

of a great name is a nuisance, especially when the bearer of that name is also *divus*.

Augustus left no legacy of prodigal expenditures and unrestrained delation. The relationship between *princeps* and senate was precarious, but had not broken down. In theory, the people did not count. Tiberius could safely deprive them of the *comitia*. Image making, with its conventional promises of respect for the senate, suppression of informers, recall of exiles, and curbing of imperial extravagances was to come after his death.

Theory and practice rarely cohere. The populace might be presumed a political cipher, but it had its expectations. Tiberius had his troubles over pantomimes and the equally histrionic house of Germanicus. Concern for the *annona* was an obvious priority. Yet as late as 32, Tacitus could describe demonstrations in the theatre over the *annona* as unusual : *gravitate annonae iuxta seditionem ventum multaque et pluris per dies in theatro licentius efflagitata quam solitum adversum imperatorem* [44].

An emperor could rarely be a remote superbureaucrat. He was expected to be accessible to written and verbal petitions [45]. The concern of, for example, Tiberius and Claudius for personal participation in the courts was more than show. Justice had to be seen to be done. It might be unnerving for barrister or defendant to find the *princeps* on the other side; if Suetonius can be trusted, however, they were not always overawed. Witness the equestrian defendant who assaulted Claudius, or the lawyer who made mock of the emperor's handling of court procedure [46]. The point is best exemplified by the woman who told Hadrian « stop being Emperor » when he tried to sidestep her petition [47].

A fire on the Caelian hill provoked the *plebs* into blaming Tiberius for his absence from the city. He quickly disbursed monetary compensations, but did not return [48]. As has been seen, Nero was more susceptible to the demand. He cancelled a trip to Egypt and the East, allegedly to placate the mob which feared the loss of food and entertainments. Yet the sources mislead. The fire of 64 soon followed; and

[44] *Ann.* 6. 13.
[45] See F. Millar, *Emperors at Work*, *JRS* 57 (1967), 9 ff.
[46] *Cl.* 15.
[47] Dio, 69. 6. 3.
[48] *Ann.* 4. 64.

Nero was not in Rome. He had to return : to do what ? Allegedly, to curtail the *annona* at the most dangerous time imaginable, and to divert the mob by punishments of the Christians so brutal as to sicken the populace.

An unconvincing picture. Broader questions go unasked, let alone unanswered. Trajan and Marcus Aurelius were frequently away on campaigns. Hadrian peregrinated about the provinces, and retired to his private Xanadu at Tivoli. Did these absences incur the wrath of the urban *plebs* ? Or is it simply that traditionally « good » emperors profit from the paucity and poor quality of their primary sources ? Emperors defer to or resist popular clamour on no fixed pattern. Commodus surrendered the expendable Cleander to the mob. By contrast, Galba, no darling of the people, would not hand over Tigellinus. Nero was persuaded to produce a scapegoat for the fire of 64, though fires were common and culprits were not always sought. The same emperor did not yield over the issue of Pedanius' slaves in 61. Human explanations can be looked for in the character of the *princeps* or his advisers. Tacitean stereotypes account for nothing.

Similar discrepancies are patent in the various imperial reactions to personal criticisms. Tacitus charges Augustus with instituting legal action *de famosis libellis* [49]. He could tolerate attacks on himself, but exiled the authors of pasquinades against prominent men, and took pains to investigate those who wrote under assumed names [50]. Tiberius was irked by this as well. Nero's attitude is ambivalent. The first two victims of *maiestas*, as had been noted, were both satirists, one of whom had attacked the emperor. Yet he was notably tolerant of insulting graffiti, and once curbed delation against their authors. This pachydermatous geniality did not extend to the Cynic Isidorus and the mime Datus, who were both exiled for tactless observations [51]. One might have expected Nero to have been more upset by graffiti which reached a wider audience; especially in view of his supposed obsession with the good opinion of the mob.

An emperor who incurs satire and abuse is not to be assumed to deserve them. The « good » rulers had their share. Antonius Pius was often gibed at by the consular Homullus [52], and Marcus Aurelius

[49] *Ann.* 1. 72.

[50] Suetonius, *Aug.* 50; Dio, 56. 27. 1.

[51] Suetonius, *Nero* 39.

[52] *HA*, *Pius* 11. 8.

and Verus were assailed by the *mimographus* Marullus [53]. Vespasian had some celebrated trouble with philosophers. Hadrian was always at odds with Favorinus and other intellectuals [54]. Satire is one of the healthiest of social phenomena. When it is suppressed, there is something rotten in the state. However, the satirist is never to be believed absolutely. Unblinkered faith in the critics of society is as naive as the assumption that every defendant in a *maiestas* trial was innocent.

The *plebs urbana* did not read satirists and historians. Nor was it enamoured of philosophers. Dio Chrysostom is eloquent witness to that [55]. Crowds might be stirred by particular showmen such as Lucian's Demonax, and Cynics could foment or exacerbate strikes and desertions by workers and peasants [56]. There were philosophers and philosophers. The long-haired Cynic, with his studied disarray and prepackaged vocabulary of abuse, was disliked as intensely by establishment intellectuals as his hippie counterpart today can be by university professors and administrators. The type is a standard object of ridicule in the pages of Aulus Gellius and Lucian. Gellius, indeed, was unusual in that he managed to combine respect for both Herodes Atticus and Peregrinus Proteus. Herodes, that multi-millionaire orator, much disliked by the Athenian populace, was a favourite target of Peregrinus [57]. Lucian displays a schizophrenic attitude : his dramatic heroes are Menippus and Diogenes, but he loathed Peregrinus and the standard Cynic practicioner of the second century.

This matter of intellectuals and their political and social alignments is vital to the theme. Between ruler and ruled, interacting on both, stood court and imperial advisers. Nowadays, there is much talk about the quality of government. The admission of intellectuals to the corridors of power is held to improve this quality. By corollary, the constriction of military spokesmen is also beneficial. This theory is naturally most purveyed and believed by intellectuals.

Ideologues have never displayed much talent for influencing the masses. A far from unhealthy situation. The case can be made that the principate was a military despotism. If so, the direct influence of generals

[53] *HA, MA* 8. 2.

[54] Dio, 69. 3. 4; *HA, Hadrian* 16. 8.

[55] *Or.* 33. 14.

[56] See my article *Lucian as Social Satirist*, *CQ* 11 (1961), 199 ff.

[57] For clashes between Herodes and Peregrinus see Lucian, *Peregrinus* 19; Philostratus, *VS* p. 563. Herodes was also rebuked by Demonax; Lucian, *Demonax* 24, 33.

on emperor and court was remarkably slender. One reason, perhaps, for the lack of warmth shown towards Agricola by Domitian. Apart from the praetorian prefect, whose functions were analogous to those of police chief and intelligence director, military men are absent from the charmed circle at Rome. Nerva's adoption of Trajan is offset by the old soldier Galba, who looked to the unwarlike Piso. An unwise hope, but a significant attitude. Generals chafed at the situation. Agricola had been dissuaded from his philosophic enthusiasms by his mother [58]. Delightfully enough, this pious pair foreshadow Nero and his mother, who warned her son to eschew abstract theories [59]. The advice may have been sound for a future emperor, though it could also have been a discreet way of disparaging Seneca. The converse situation was achieved by Marcus Aurelius. With a notable consequence. When Avidius Cassius revolted in 175, he made much play with the philosophic excesses of Marcus [60]. No wonder that Herodes Atticus took haste to inform Avidius, in a note celebrated for its brevity, that he was mad [61].

Almost every reign displayed men of letters in high places. Imperial tutors are scrupulously registered in the biographies. Men such as Petronius, Pliny, and Tacitus governed provinces. An indifferent poet like Silius Italicus could be present at highly secret negotiations in the height of civil war [62]. He was also infamous for delation [63]. The sophists of the second century were everywhere in high places [64].

In theory, the ruled stood to gain from such influences. Men of letters and philosophic speculation might be presumed to impose beneficial checks on wayward emperors and traditional villains of the stamp of Tigellinus. In practice, it was not always the case. There is no proof that intellectuals are more virtuous or more dedicated to humanity than unlettered pragmatists. If the theory is pushed, paradox comes in to spoil it. Trajan, the *optimus princeps*, was not notable for education, and was addicted to drink and boys.

[58] *Agr.* 4.

[59] Suetonius, *Nero* 52.

[60] *HA, Avid.* 14. 5.

[61] Philostratus, *VS* p. 563.

[62] *Hist.* 3. 65.

[63] Pliny, *Ep.* 3. 7.

[64] See G. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (1969); E.L. Bowie, *Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic, Past & Present* 46 (1970), 3 ff.

Too often, assessments of the relationship between the emperor and the people are based on distinction between the « bad » Julio-Claudians and the adoptive « good » emperors. This is a myth which had gained by its purveyance by such seductive writers as Tacitus and Gibbon. The identification of adoption and virtue is a delusion. Octavian was adoptive; so was Tiberius. The procedure prospered in the second century because of a dearth of natural sons and heirs. One « bad » adoptive *princeps* would have exploded the legend. Its adherents had a narrow escape when Hadrian's earlier choice, Ceionius Commodus, died : his only quality had been his looks [65].

Simple correlations do not work out. It is often maintained that history is the history of the ruling class. Roman imperial history is the version of the ex-ruling class. A « good » emperor was one who flattered the pretensions of the senate. Devotion to the masses was not the way to a good press from Tacitus. Moreover, the source suffer from a built-in distortion. By chance or design, there are no biographies of Nerva and Trajan. They are squeezed out between Suetonius and the *Historia Augusta*. In the latter case, a shortage of erotic anecdotes may be to blame. Yet there was some available material on the sexual activities of Nerva and Trajan. And the impact of emperors' private lives on the well-being of the public is absurdly overrated. Roman moralists were easy to shock. Viewed coolly, the erotic exploits in the biographies do not add up to much. In fact, the most distinguished sexual pervert in the first century was Hostius Quadra. And Martial knew at least as much about erotic refinements as any emperor. It is a fair assumption that the Suburra did not lag behind the Palatine in sexual sophistication. The morality of the masses does not wait for a lead from the top. In England, the reigns of Victoria and Elizabeth the Second have been notable for widespread sensuality and the « permissive society ». These two monarchs offer little scope for lubricious anecdote.

In tentative conclusion. Bread and games may have been the dominant preoccupations of the urban populace. If so, both pursuits were legitimate. They were not the only ones. Extraneous issues, such as the fate of slaves or Octavia, evoked protest and demonstration. The spontaneity of riots can be called into question; the fact is unchallenged. Imperial reaction might be as capricious. Fear, exaspera-

[65] *HA, Hadrian* 23. 10.

tion, or persuative advisors could all sway policy. Popularity is a natural desire, but emperors such as Nero did not court it indiscriminately. Rulers had their rivals in the quest for mass approval. Intellectuals and philosophers carried on the hypocrisy of a Cicero : private disdain and public solicitation. Satirists and historians chipped away at everything. Contentment is the mother of very few epigrams. Basic issues such as poverty did not go unheeded, but were rarely the first priorities. Nevertheless, a Tiberius and a Vespasian would show more concern for employment and the economy than a Tacitus. Roman history is often inexplicable by modern criteria. Why, for instance, after the paragon Antoninus Pius, did Marcus Aurelius have to auction off the palace furnishings ? Surely Verus' banquets had not been that extravagant ? Above all, the dichotomy between « good » emperor and « bad », between adoptive ruler and dynast, has to be jettisoned. Nerva is the supreme refutation. He had won singular preferment under Nero for helping to suppress the conspiracy of Piso [66]. Like Tacitus and Trajan, he had not done badly under Domitian. Pliny was disgusted to find him tolerating Fabricius Veiento [67]. Why the surprise ? It is no more astonishing that Tacitus elected to reserve his account of the reigns of Nerva and Trajan for his old age [68]. Such a cautious decision might ensure that he would have that old age.

The people did not create the stereotypes of good and bad emperors. It was not theirs to decide whom to deify and whom to condemn. They might find nothing of benefit in an emperor pronounced acceptable by a senatorial historian, and a great deal in the traditional villains. A large proportion of Roman historiography was mere moralising : Tacitus admitted as much [69]. Moralists tend to wear hair shirts made of the purest silk ; they do not make credible historians. And intellectuals are far from the best source of knowledge of what people want and expect from their rulers. Mobs help to make history ; unfortunately they do not help to write it.

[66] *Ann.* 15. 72.

[67] *Ep.* 4. 22. 4.

[68] *Hist.* 1. 1.

[69] *Ann.* 3. 65 : *praecipuum munus annalium reor ne virtutes sileantur utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit.*

LXIX

POWER CORRUPTS – AND ABSOLUTE POWER IS EVEN NICER: SOME THOUGHTS ON RECENT ASSESSMENTS OF THE ROMAN EMPERORS

I gloss my title with the congenial (whether or not so intended) remark of a generally sympathetic reviewer of my book *The Roman Emperors* (Montreal 1980) to the effect that my defence of power must have been conditioned by having been a department head. As they say on television, I take the Fifth Amendment on that! What I intend here are some thoughts on the principate primarily in the light of three recent studies: Fergus Miller's *The Emperor in the Roman World*, Geoffrey de Ste Croix' *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (in which there is more about Rome than Greece, as Brunt remarks at the outset of his *JRS 72*[1982] review), and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's article '*Civilis Princeps*: between citizen and king', also in *JRS 72*. And, since like George Bernard Shaw I often quote myself to lend spice to the conversation, I shall obtrude some of the notions that put me in the eyes of liberal friends somewhere to the right of Attila the Hun.

First, though I don't like the word, methodology. One of the phony wars raging between scholars is that of biography versus history. Syme, for instance, pronounced biography to be 'cheap and easy'. Millar used his *JRS 56*[1966] review of Grosso's *La lotta politica al tempo di Commodo* to reject the concept of imperial biography on the grounds that (in his words) neither the actions of an emperor nor the politics of a particular reign can be meaningfully studied until the whole social context of the imperial power has been examined over a substantial period, and perhaps not even then. A tall order! Meanwhile the debate continues - as does the production of imperial biographies.

On which a quick word. There have been some good ones in recent years, notably Anthony Birley's matching set on Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus. Conspicuously absent, and this is a call to arms for those looking for a field of research, is Domitian. Of course, it it dangerous to point out such lacunae. One used to say the same thing about Pompey, and now we can hardly move for volumes on that great subject. Domitian can arouse in modern scholars the same passions as he did in his own world. *experto crede*! The ground work for a proper assessment was laid almost twenty years ago by K.H.Waters in his *Phoenix 18*(1964) paper 'The character of Domitian', later reinforced by '*Traianus Domitiani continuator*' in *AJP 90* (1969). Waters adopts a more favourable view than is usual. Some years ago my reward for citing these in an article was a referee's comment 'Why does he bother with these silly articles?'. *C'est la vie scholaire*! But how much longer shall we abide a situation whereby the most detailed study of Domitian in English is Sylvia Fraser's Canadian soft-core novel *The Emperor's Virgin*?!

Given his views on biogrpahy, it may be surprising that Millar's basic formulation is "the emperor 'was' what the emperor did", albeit the inverted commas placed around 'was' seem to betray some qualms. The book weighs in at 657 pages, though even so it is outgrossed by the 732 of de Ste Croix. Scholars should perhaps take to heart the old adage that to be immortal one does not have to be eternal. Stodgy and inert from the point of view of style, Millar's book deserves all the credit it has received for its collection of documentary raw materials. What he does with them is another story, one reserved for later.

The portentous marxism of de Ste Croix is something from which I am temperamentally averse. de Ste Croix, incidentally, has to admit (p.24) that Marx, although versed in the Republic, never made a systematic study of the principate, hence his hero is no help, which may be why the emperors receive only about thirty pages of his brobdingnagian volume. I focus here on the one aspect common to the works under review and my own, namely the role of the individual in history.

I myself believe that great individuals and luck, good or bad in both cases, are the prime determiners of historical change (I don't say progress!). Sulla *felix* comes easily to mind: so does Pompeius *magnus*. I have deliberately flitted into the late Republic here, When one considers the bleak view of Sallust, or Cicero on the *piscinarii* - senators who would let the country go hang as long as their fishponds were preserved - the dramatic moral distinctions drawn by textbooks between Republic and principate tend to weaken. Indeed, to judge from what he has to admit near the beginning of *Annals 1*, and from epigrams such as the one on Pompey - *occultior non melior* - I doubt that Tacitus on the Republic would have been that much different from Tacitus on the principate in terms of diagnosing and describing human behaviour.

The great man theory of history is one that perturbs marxists and other -isms. E.H.Carr, for instance, in his well known *What is history?* begins a discussion by claiming that 'it has gone out of fashion in recent years, though it still occasionally rears its ungainly head'. Carr's professed target is the view which places great men outside history and sees them as imposing themselves on history in virtue of their greatness. He closes his argument with this piece of gobbledy-gook from Hegel: "The great man of his age is the one who ... actualizes his age'.

I shall continue to believe that Julius Caesar and Augustus imposed their greatness on Rome. Carr was not a marxist, and his problems do not compare with those of de Ste Croix and the comrades. A pleasingly splendid example of this sort of historian getting all tied up in the knots of theory is Isaac Deutscher, whose Trotsky trilogy (*The Prophet Armed, Unarmed, Betrayed*) is forever wobbling between giving all the credit for 1917 to the Russian proletariat (ludicrously described by him as 'one of history's wonders') and remembering that his own hero was more than a lump of clay.

As A.J.P.Taylor - who, like the best historians, has no theory of history - remarked in reviewing Deutscher, 'the reader must put up with this hocus-pocus for the sake of the gigantic individual who overshadows it'. One may add that his collectivist view did not prevent Deutscher from casting his account into biographical form. Also, Deutscher and de Ste Croix are really not very good marxists. Since Engels had firmly stated that there was no proletariat in his sense before the French Revolution, his epigones have no warrant for chattering about a Roman one. Marx himself broke this rule in his preposterous description of Spartacus as 'the most splendid fellow in the whole of ancient history. Great general, noble character, real representative of the ancient proletariat '. de Ste Crox defends this on the grounds that it is in a letter to Engels (Feb.27, 1861), not a published work. Nor did Lenin bind himself to the collectivist view of things, remarking as he once did that the only interesting question in history was 'Who whom?'.

The success of the bolshevik *coup* cannot be divorced from the time of Lenin's arrival at the Finalnd Station. Likewise, the freak elevation of Claudius in 41 wrote finis to the brief hopes of the republicans. For had Claudius been *tollendus* in the way Cicero had once planned for Octavian things might have turned out differently. As it was, in Gibbon's pluperfect phrase, 'whilst the senate deliberated, the praetorians had resolved'.

As to power. Mao notoriously said it came from the barrel of a gun, which is only a technological variant on what a Roman legionary had shouted to the Senate in 43 B.C.. But this is about the gaining of power, not the exercise of Despite the subtleties of *The Roman Revolution*, can it be reasonably denied that Augustus improved? Well, Tacitus might, but what of his similar tribute (*Hist.1.*50) to Vespasian: *solum omnium ante se principum in melius mutatus est*? Suetonius (*Titus* 7) awards the same sort of compliment to Titus. Poor Domitian: he stood in the shadow of not one great name but two!

Take the pivotal reign of Tiberius. It is quite clear from Tacitus that he was not corrupted by power - he was already corrupt, something that emerged when rid of the personal restraints imposed by other people, themselves presumably beyond corruption. Or take Caligula, equated - a certain film apart - with irresponsibility thanks to Camus. He was undeniably a bad emperor, and his early appearance in the sequence is at first blush congenial to the Tacitean thesis. But from Suetonius and the *obiter dicta* of Tacitus himself, it is obvious that Caligula would have been just the same had he been the twenty-third *princeps* rather than the third. Also that he would have been no better as a private citizen. The mosters of Roman history did not have to be emperors: witness scum like Vedius Pollio or Hostius Quadra.

Whilst on this tack, we may as well demolish the cognate nonsense of Gibbon and company that a distinction is to be drawn between the five good emperors of the late 1st and 2nd centuries and their predecessors. Gibbon finds the distinction in adoption, overlooking the awkward fact that Tiberius, Caligula and Nero were equally adoptive. It is all a question of bias in the sources. As Robert Browning has recently observed when introducing the later empire in that new and largely futile titan *The Cambridge History of Latin Literature*, the changed composition of the Senate meant that senatorial historians were no longer anti-principate as a matter of course.

The double standard is ubiquitous. Take what many would consider the two key issues of *maiestas* and morality. I do not for one moment deny that innocent people died under the rubric of treason. But we must certainly beware of such melodramas as that of Tacitus, *Annals 15.*71, where a column (*agmen*) of victims going to their deaths turns out on inspection to be precisely five men! This is in connexion with Piso, whose guilt as a conspirator is not denied. Ammianus (19.12.17) was to argue that the safety *legitimi principis* must be defended by the united diligence of all men, and that in a case of *maiestas pulsata* torture was applicable to all classes. In my opinion, every society has the right to formulate a legal definition of treason; and even if one disagrees, it cannot be said that the emperors had a monopoly on it.

Imperial *mores* are measured by the same flexible yardstick. For easy instance, in Dio's epitomated account of Trajan, that emperor is admitted to have been addicted to drink and boys. But since he was *optimus princeps* excuses are found that would not have been in the case of a bad one. The gluttony of a Claudius or Vitellius is censured, but not that of Antoninus Pius, who died from a surfeit of Alpine cheese. And so on.

Millar and Wallace-Hadrill both begin with the emperor's handling of petitions. Rightly, though I do not understand why the latter says that the Latin sources are uninterested in this aspect: it is easy to find in Suetonius, easier yet in the section of Macrobius devoted to Augustan *bons mots*. Incidentally, it is worth noting that the subject tends to come up in the shape of an anecdote with a comic punchline at its conclusion, arguably a disclosure of the human tensions that must have accompanied the basic situation.

Imperial handling of petitions and attitude to paperwork are central themes. As they are of course today. One often reads that physical accessibility to petitioners is a safety valve that helps to keep the Saudi Arabian dynasty in power. It has well been said that genius is an infinite capacity for taking pains. The sources disclose bad emperors as well as good devoting much of their time to the grind. Tacitus, *Ann.14.*18, for example, shows Nero involved in the not very exciting question of land ownership in Cyrene.

Not all the big questions can be answered, but somebody once said that the historian should be judged by his questions not his answers, so we need not be too depressed by that. How many emperors read their paper as closely as Augustus, who famously dismissed an official for misspelling *ipsi* as *ixi*? On his attitude to literacy, *o si sic omnes*! Did Trajan get as much bumf flowing in from every other province as from Bithynia under Pliny? If so, then emperors must willy-nilly have found themselves in the quandary of Jim Hacker in *Yes, Minister*, and Tony Honoré

is right, in his *JRS 69*(1979) paper on imperial rescripts, to minimize the ruler's actual role in their composition.

Which brings us back to Millar. The emperor was what the emperor did. Judged by his own standards, which is fair enough, the book is a success. The enormous amount of material he has assembled to all intents and purposes completes the work of Mommsen. The administrative history of the empire has now been written, apart from epigraphic and papyrological dotting and crossing of Is and Ts. What is missing is that which Graham Greene has called *The Human Factor*. In the interests of fairness I call a third witness to the stand to make the point for me. Concluding his detailed critique of Millar in *JRS 68*(1978), Keith Hopkins wrote as follows: 'I get from it no feeling of what it was like to be an emperor, none of their hopes, ambitions, fears'.

That is it in a nutshell. For instance, one of Millar's texts is Galen's account of the Antonine wine cellars, with their Falernian vintages a century old and more. The great doctor says he tasted these, but reached no verdict. One imagines these bottles would resemble Trimalchio's notorious Opimian. Possibly we should formulate a Tacitean dogma: there can be bad wines even under good emperors.

To Millar, the item is just one more in a long list of treasures, to be cited and dismissed. Wines in themselves are not important. The point is, what men may do because of what wine has done to them can be. This is equally true of many seeming trivia. It is important, for example, to know what an emperor looked like, because of the physiognomonical theories of the ancients. If we are ever to have Roman history comparable to Ferdinand Braudel's account of the Mediterranean world of the 16th century, or Richard Cobb's 18th century France, it is precisely here that we must go. For all their faults, Suetonius and even the accursed *Historia Augusta* were on the right track. As stated, the administrative history of Rome is complete. What we now want is something along the lines of what Peter Brown has done for late antiquity, using first and foremost - it may be emphasized - hagiographical lives. In short, the emotional history of the principate.

LXX

THE SPORTS FANS OF ROME AND BYZANTIUM

This topic is not one on which much new information can reasonably be expected. As compensation, however - indeed as justification - there is scope in asking if not always answering some questions of basic importance not always raised in existing studies. Contrariwise, towards the end, there will be brief occasion to examine anew the motivations of Byzantine sports fans, an old issue recently spotlighted in Alan Cameron's masterly work of demolition, *Circus Factions*. Finally, since like Oscar Wilde I can resist everything except temptation, some analogies will be drawn from modern sports fans, above all the notorious British soccer hooligans.

At the risk of perpetrating a paradox in Roman context, the circus factions claim the lion's share of my attention. Not that partisans of the gladiators and mimes will be absent. Indeed, taken together, they all allow an initial question of great importance: what proportion of Romans watched each entertainment? Does the fact that the Colosseum accommodated far fewer spectators than the Circus Maximus permit the optimistic inference that more Romans preferred the harmless races to death in the afternoon? In Juvenal's famous *panem et circenses*, do we take circuses literally, or is it generic for all public entertainments?

Furthermore, which social classes attended? Snobbish remarks by such as Cicero and Pliny (*Epp.9.6*), the contemptuous generalizations of Tacitus, and the well known imperial aversion from the arena and the circus (or at least from the costs of sponsorship) in the cases of men so

different as Tiberius and Macus Aurelius have produced a general scholarly view that these entertainments were put on for the masses. Therefore it is worth recalling that Juvenal's delinquents are the *populus*, not the *plebs* or *vulgus*; also that Fronto's less familiar refinement of the epigram refers to the entire citizen body. Marcus Aurelius may have begun his *Meditations* by thanking his tutor that he was not a Blue or a Green, but the sources at large show that everyone from Emperor to Trimalchio's porter ('you damned Green', as his master calls him) could be seen at the races.

Nor, with regard to the arena, did the upper classes have any monopoly on pity. Tacitus (*Ann. 1.*76) and Dio (57.13.1) say that Drusus (son of Tiberius) was unpopular on account of his excessive love of gladiators, whilst Tacitus elsewhere acknowledges, accidentally or with reluctance, that the *vulgus* was as sickened by Nero's punishments of the Christians as by the mass execution of Pedanius Secundus' slaves.

A political safety valve, that is many people's explanation for imperial sponsorship of the games. An anecdote in both Dio (54.17.5) and Macrobius (2.7.19) has a pantomime answer Augustus' rebuke for quarrelling with a rival with these words: 'You are ungrateful, Sir; it is to your advantage that the people devote their spare time to us'. Here it is the pop stars that are thus useful, not charioteers or gladiators (cf. the thesis of Peter Watkin's movie *Privilege*). Again, Juvenal and Fronto are largely responsible for the popularity of this view.

Things may not be quite that simple. There were probably many real life fans like Echion in Petronius, for whom a good day's arena fighting had to be a butcher's shop (*carnarium*). But the catharsis was of his sadistic emotions rather than his political ones. After all, the games in question were put on by a local bigwig, and Echion's indignation at his cheeseparing is not drained off.

Largely because of *panem et circenses* (and incidentally this seems not original to Juvenal and Rome; Dio Chrysostom, 32.31, castigates the Alexandrians for craving only bread and races), we tend to think of the entertainments as an imperial device. However, there are well documented fanaticisms from the Republican period. I am not thinking so much of the disruptions of the première of Terence's *Hecyra* by the rival attractions of rope walkers and gladiators (cf. D.Gilula, *Athenaeum 59*[1981], 29-37) as of the fan who (Pliny, *NH 7*.186) committed suttee on the pyre of his beloved Red charioteer, Felix. Incidentally, Pliny found this item *in actis*, which may confirm Friedlaender's notion that the *acta diurna* regularly carried sports news. That would be logical (we know from Seneca that the *acta* were never without a divorce story), albeit Juvenal gets news of a Green victory not from the gazette but from the crowd's noise (11.98); and the enterprising owner of chariots, Caecina, sent news of his victories to absent friends by carrier swallows, each one *inlito victoriae colore* (Pliny, *NH 10*.71).

The astonishing thing about imperial Rome is the almost total absence of documented riots. An outbreak in the Colosseum under Commodus had to do with famine, not sport; the Circus Maximus seems equally quiet. Riots are one of the very few things excluded from the doleful register of metropolitan dangers in Juvenal's Third Satire. Writing in Tacitean terms of the Roman mob in the fourth century, Ammianus (28.4.28) condemns the passion for racing but does not suggest that it went beyond noise.

Could this have something to do with the well organized crowd control that we know existed in the case of the Colosseum, with its tickets of admission and regulated blocks of seats? The question gains force from comparison between the relatively orderly North American fans and the terrifying British ones. The former tend to travel in small groups and sit in decent comfort, whilst the latter move in large packs and stand in often miserable conditions. It is, after all, difficult to 'hot-leg' a rival fan from a sitting position!

Interestingly and significantly, the best documented outbreak of sports violence is from the provinces, specifically that reported by Tacitus (*Ann.14*.17; cf. W.Moeller, *Historia 19* [1970], 84-95). A gladiatorial show at Pompeii in 59 produced an *atrox caedes* in which the home crowd killed many visiting fans from Nuceria in a brawl that progressed from insults to stones to knives. After some buck passing between emperor, senate and consuls, an investigation resulted in the exiling of the ringleaders (and, less fairly, the sponsor), the closure of the theatre for ten years, and (most interestingly to the legal historian) the suppression of the *collegia quae contra leges instituerant*.

Tacitus does not use this occasion for one of his mordant generalities about mass behaviour, and the incident remains (to us) an isolated one. Attempts have been made to explain this lack of violence, contrasting as it does with the coeval troubles over pantomimes, as being simply the misleading product of lost or silent sources. The *Sunday Telegraph* of November 8th, 1981, reprinted a photograph and account of a London soccer riot in 1895, as a reminder that the British problem is not new. Still, the sources we possess, Juvenal, Tacitus, the *HA*, Ammianus, and so on, are not the sort who would have wished to expurgate the record.

Be that as it may, the factions of early Byzantium more than compensate for this lack of action. The classic account is that of Procopius, who describes how the Blues and Greens wore long moustaches and beards, cultivated 'Hunnic' hairstyles, involving a short cut along the temples in front and long at the back, and wore garments cut to billow around shoulders, chests and wrists, to give an impression of pumping iron facades whereas one could in fact quite safely have kicked sand into their faces. Their similarities (along with some differences of trichological and sartorial detail) to the Skinheads and Bovver Boys of Britain are palpable.

Had it stood alone, Procopius' account might have been suspect, given that it occurs in his

notoriously exaggerated *Secret History*. But other sources abundantly confirm it. This contrast of behaviour with imperial Rome might seem harmful to Cameron's thesis. One reason might simply be that with the disappearance of gladiatorial and beast shows, a greater number of sadistic thugs now, *faute de mieux*, joined in with the circus factions. Also perhaps with the pantomime crowds, whose consistently high level of uproar now also intensifies. Female nudity and the astonishing performance of soubrettes like Theodora will also have attracted those who in earlier days might have preferred the topless gladiatrix of Juvenal's First Satire (confirmed by text and illustrations on *CIG* 6855, discussed in L.Robert, *Les Gladiateurs dans l'Orient Grec*, 188). For, whereas in Rome they had fought over male dancers, in Byzantium women were often the top stars. Witness the epigrams of Agathias and company, one of which (*AP* 5.297) describes how colour paintings of them lined the Mese.

Cameron's *Circus Factions*, argued with his customary learning and verve, should largely put out of court the traditional correlations between colours and politics. As I have suggested in an amiable exchange of views with him in the pages of *Byzantium*, he may have gone too far in saying that there is not one scrap of evidence for any religious motivation for rioting. After all, Malalas, who has neither enough learning nor historical imagination to invent any ideas, saw the factions as rooted in 'religious-like dissensions'. And it is hard to credit that religion and street violence could never go together in an atmosphere described thus by Gregory of Nysa (appropriated by Graves in the opening pages of *Count Belisarius*): 'The city is full of slaves and mechanics, all of them profound theologians. If you want a man to change money, he informs you of in what the Son differs from the Father; if you ask the price of bread, you are told that the Son is inferior to the Father; and if you ask if the bath is ready, the answer is that the Son was begotten out of nothing".

The ultimate destiny of the Byzantine Blues and Greens was to sing in massed choirs at the court ceremonies of later emperors, along with a surrogate in which they enacted such sporting abstrusities as the Gothic Game at the Feast of the Nineteen Beds. A logical fate in that in their sixth century heyday the factions had routinely numbered a poet in their ranks - not that the extant specimens of their slogans (e.g. 'Burn here, burn there. | Not a Green (Blue) anywhere') suggest that they are notably more articulate than their Roman predecessors (*hoc habet*) or British (endless iteration of 'You'll Never Walk Alone') successors.

LXXI

POEMS ON MEMNON

Literally on Memnon. The singing statue was a popular tourist attraction[1] at Thebes in Egypt from (apparently) the first to the late second or early third century A.D. Many individuals commemorated their visits by graffiti carved on the base, legs, and feet of Memnon. These one hundred or so texts[2] offer a congenial farrago of literary, historical, and prosopographical topics.

Properly speaking, the statue was a ruined colossus of Amenhotep III, a pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty. But some bright spark (to borrow Philostratus' strained etymology for Ethiopian in his version of the matter), possibly a canny entrepreneur in the Egyptian tourist industry, spread the belief that the statue was really of Memnon, son of the Dawn, whom Achilles slew at Troy. A nice and salutary reminder of how historical fact could be garbled in antiquity.

Strabo (17. 816c) is the first author to describe the phenomenon. His account of attending a recital is a model for the graffiti to come. Along with Aelius Gallus and a crowd of visiting firemen, Strabo heard the song of Memnon around the first hour of sunrise. The geographer is duly sceptical about the cause, noting a correlation between the origin of the recitals and the shattering of the statue by a recent earthquake, and drily suggesting that the noise might have been made by a 'plant' in the audience.

Pausanias (1. 42. 3), as befits the writer of an honest guidebook, was equally guarded in his account; so, perhaps more surprisingly, is the elder Pliny (*NH* 36. 58). The fully credulous and extravagant version is by Philostratus (*VA* 6. 4), whose hero Apollonius of Tyana made a pilgrimage to the statue in the first century.[3]

Textbooks[4] confidently state that Memnon lost his voice after being repaired by Septimius Severus during a visit to Egypt in 202. It comes as

* This paper was originally read to the fourth annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Canadian West, Vancouver, February 21, 1981.

1. For a detailed account (albeit not always accurate), see L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Toronto, 1974), 260-1, 272-8, 284-5.

2. *CIG* 3. 4719-61; *CIL* 3. 30-66. Detailed studies (not always readily accessible) by Letronne, *La Statue vocale de Memnon* (Paris, 1833); A. Bataille, *Les Memnonia* (Cairo, 1952); A. & E. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du colosse de Memnon* (Cairo, 1960).

3. Cf. Callistratus, *Descr.* 1. 4, 9.

4. For easy instance, A. R. Birley, *Septimius Severus* (London, 1971), 207; H. M. D. Parker, *A History of the Roman World A.D. 138-337* (2nd ed., London, 1958), 71.

something of a shock to realise that this rests not only upon the unique[5] testimony of the *Historia Augusta*, which is bad enough, but upon the words (culminating the imperial travelogue) *nam et Memphim et Memnonem et pyramides et labyrinthum diligenter inspexit* (*Sev.* 17. 4).

On this evidence alone, it might be inferred simply that Septimius duly attended one of Memnon's performances, as Hadrian before him had done. Nevertheless, correlation of this with the apparent drying-up of the graffiti—the last datable one comes from 196 or 205—does imply that something happened to Memnon's voice in this period.[6]

Who went to hear Memnon? No emperors, it should be noted, apart from Hadrian, for whom the capricious statue eventually performed after initial silence, and Septimius Severus. It is piquant that the *HA*, the sole evidence for the latter's interest, has nothing to say about the former's. The visits of Hadrian are commemorated by the graffiti of his wife Sabina and a lady poet of the royal entourage.

One emperor who might have been expected to go is Nero. And, had he not aborted his planned trip to Alexandria, no doubt he would have done. What a shame this did not materialise: the prospect of a confrontation between singing statue and singing emperor boggles the mind!

Perhaps taking their cue from Aelius Gallus, several prefects of Egypt attended performances; it may have become a ritual diplomatic courtesy. When Germanicus went to Egypt *cognoscendae antiquitatis* in the year 19, he included Memnon in his itinerary. Since it is his Prince Charming who is in question, Tacitus manages to report the phenomenon (*Ann.* 2. 61) without any sneers at credulity or Egyptians. Truer to personal form is Juvenal, whose opening catalogue of Egyptian monstrosities includes the sally *dimidio magicae resonant ubi Memnone chordae* (15. 5).

Memnon was a natural 'must' for Roman soldiers stationed in Egypt. How fortunate for their relatives back home that the colour slide had not yet been invented. That is, if you share my view that showing holiday slides is the eighth deadly sin. Ancient tourists could be as boastful as their modern counterparts. Lucian (*Philopseudes* 33) has a character who claims that to himself, and himself alone, Memnon vouchsafed not the usual song but a personalised oracle of seven verses. Fortunately for the fellow, lack of time precluded his quoting them. A number of *strategi*, prefects, and so on left their calling card on the statue. So did ordinary soldiers. Some took their wives and children. Others went in parties: two inscriptions are the collective work of trios of army buddies. Here again, we can adduce Lucian, who (*Toxaris* 27) includes visits to Memnon in his catalogue of demonstrations of friendship.

5. No mention in Dio's account (75. 13. 1-3) of the emperor in Egypt, nor in Herodian.
6. For the possible date of 205 for *CIL* 3. 52, cf. *CIL* 3, p. 968.

Londoners are famous for their inability to direct tourists to the Tower, and there must be some New Yorkers who have never been to Times Square. No doubt many locals were either ignorant or contemptuous of Memnon. But some went along with the tourists and left their memorials. One such case is a certain Artemidorus, who signs himself *basilikos grammateus.* Another, more interesting visitor was Areius, self-styled Homeric poet from the Museum, of uncertain date: could he be in any way descended from that famous Alexandrian philosopher Areius[7] who was so influential with Augustus?

Plain courtesy demands that we close this survey of Memnon's visitors with a mention of his most devoted fan on record. A certain Tanicius (his very name is rare, being nowhere attested in *PIR, PLRE,* or any onomasticon) paid no less than thirteen visits over eight months in the years 80/81. A clear precursor of all those little old ladies who have racked up their one hundredth visit to *Sound of Music.*

The forty-five Latin graffiti monopolise Memnon's right foot, and take up most of his left. The sixty-one Greek ones occupy the legs and base. I venture no racial inferences as to respective physical characteristics of energy or height! One is bilingual, not the work of Pierre Trudeau, but of Petronius Secundus, one of the more interesting prefects of Egypt. Rather more than half the Greek efforts are in verse, as opposed to only four of the Latin ones. The reason is partly literary—Homeric cento suited a character from the Trojan War—but largely practical: Greek would ensure a bigger local audience, and was easier for the local masons who seem often to have been hired to carve the more elaborate inscriptions.

The verses encompass hexameters, elegiacs, and iambics. Some run to fourteen lines or so in length. Their language is largely unremarkable, though one poem discloses the epithet *kallilogos,* absent from *LSJ* and other lexica, whilst another has the very rare technical term *enarchos.*[8] Homeric cento is the prevailing mood. Five poems by Julia Balbilla of the entourage of Hadrian and Sabina are in not always very authentic Aeolic, an often-overlooked piece of evidence for the revival of Greek dialects in the second century laughed at by Lucian.[9] A recurring theme in the verses on Memnon is the physical injury allegedly done him by Cambyses, a notion

7. *PIR*² A 1035; cf. G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), 33-4, 39-41.

8. Unique, if read as a noun; very rare as an adjective. *LSJ* offer two examples: *IG Rom.* 1. 1060. 4; *OGI* 715. The word is not in H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (Toronto, 1974), or R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (Case Western Reserve, 1971). Another unusual title recorded in the graffiti is *tagos* (not in Fink or Mason), attached to a certain Catulus (not in *PIR*²). Conceivably a deliberate archaism on the part of this poetry-writing official.

9. *De Hist. Conscr.* 16, 18; cf. B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto, 1973), 33.

that is generally if not precisely supportable by the Herodotean account of that mad monarch's depredations in Egypt.[10]

Sometimes, one of these inscriptions on Memnon adds to our knowledge of a career. The prefect Petronius Secundus, for easy instance, who went on to become praetorian prefect, in which capacity he was involved in both the assassination of Domitian and the elevation of Nerva, heard Memnon on March 14, 95, thus adding two years to Reinmuth's estimation of his Egyptian tenure and three to Casson's.[11]

Or they may fill out the history of a family. The poet Julia Balbilla traces back her pedigree to the royal house of Commagene and the *sophos* Balbillus. Which may connect her with that Balbillus who was an astrologer so favoured by Nero as to gain the prefecture of Egypt.[12] On this reckoning, Balbilla's visit in 130 will have been something of a sentimental journey for her.

Some of Memnon's visitors did not deserve their exclusion from *PIR,* and so from the historical record.[13] We are are so well endowed with ancient blue-stockings that we can easily spare the lady poet Caecilia Trebulla. Her male counterparts Areius the Homerist and Mettius Paion also warrant commemoration. So do Pardalas of Sardis, whose iambic graffiti promise to immortalise Memnon 'in my books', and the self-styled poet and sophist Falernus, a rare combination in the Antonine and Severan periods to which he belongs.[14] Various *strategi* and *praefecti* might also be allowed to come in from the cold. Helius, for instance, *praefectus alae Aprianae,* who heard Memnon on February 23, 170; if only for the sake of his wife and son: their names, Maecenatia and Maecenas Lucanus, should finally persuade Petronian commentators that Trimalchio's *cognomen* Maecenatianus is *not* a clue to the date of the *Satyricon*!

Like their counterparts at Pompeii, the Memnon graffiti are a boon to students of onomastics. Rare names attested include: Achilleus, Balbinianus, Gamelius, Haniochus, Instuleius, Mithridaticus, and Tanicius. Prosopographers may also add to their harvests. Apart from the characters already mentioned, we encounter: Bonus, a *neokoros* of the Museum; the

10. Strabo, immediately before his account of Memnon, mentions the mutilations of temples by Cambyses.

11. O. W. Reinmuth, 'A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt, 30 B.C.—299 A.D.,' *BASP* 4 (1967), 90; Casson, *op. cit.*, 277.

12. In equating the astrologer with the prefect, I follow Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 508, n. 9, in defiance of Stein, *PIR*² B 38; the pedigree goes further back if Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (Berlin, 1922), 393, was right to make Balbillus the son of Thrasyllus.

13. I am writing in detail elsewhere on all of these missing persons.

14. Falernus and the poetry-writing officials of the graffiti may do something to temper the dogmata of Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), 116-7, concerning the low state of poets and poetry at this time.

strategi Celer and Chaeremon; Felix, *libertus* and imperial procurator; the prefects Fuscus Sabinius, Helius, and Lucretianus; and finally, Suedius Clemens, a fascinating minor character in first-century history, being attested as tribune on a Pompeian inscription and camp prefect in Egypt, occurring briefly in Tacitus (*Hist.* 1. 87; 2. 12) as a *primipilaris*. Some of these details are absent from the notice of him in the recent commentary on the *Histories* by Chilver.

Finally, Memnon might turn out to be an unexpected aid to literary chronology. The epistolographer Alciphron has never been dated with precision. Not a great matter in itself: Alciphron is not important enough for that. But it would be useful to have a clue, since it bears upon the perennial problem of his literary relationship with Lucian.[15] *Ep.* 4. 19 (a reference that escaped even the eagle eye of Mayor on Juvenal 15. 5) talks to the playwright Menander about yearning for the sights of Egypt, including the singing statue. This is not an anachronism dredged up to fit Menander, for we have seen that the phenomenon is not attested before Strabo. If Memnon was silenced by Septimius Severus, then Alciphron will have written not later than the first decade of the third century.

15. Fully explored, with detailed bibliography, in the Loeb edition (1949) of Benner-Fobes, concluding thus: 'A *terminus ante quem* for the life of Alciphron is therefore still to seek.' Cf. Schmid's notice in *PW* 1, 1548-9.

LXXII

POLYPHAGUS: GLUTTON OR CROCODILE?

In *Nero* 37.2, Suetonius records that the emperor had the notion of throwing living men *polyphago cuidam Aegypti generis crudam carnem et quidquid daretur mandere assueto.* R. J. Littman suggests (*AJP* 97 [1976] 369) that *polyphagus* means "crocodile," not "glutton." An intriguing idea, but one that is seriously weakened, if not refuted, by the following evidence.

Polyphagus is not, in spite of Littman's assertion, a *hapax legomenon* in Latin. For one thing, it is defined in the Latin Glosses[1] as *multa manducans,* which shows how the word was understood in later times.

More to the point is a passage in that fourth-century compiler known to us as the Chronographer of the Year 354. His entry under Nero begins thus: *hoc imp. fuit polyfagus natione Alexandrinus nomine Arpocras, qui manducavit pauca* (a long list, highly improbable, of all the items consumed by this creature follows).

The entry confirms the existence of a notable glutton in Nero's reign. He must have featured in sources other than Suetonius, since the biographer does not give his name or the precise information concerning his native city.

Our Chronographer has a very similar item in his entry under Alexander Severus: *hoc imp. fuit polyphagus natione Italus qui manducavit pauca* (again, a detailed inventory of things consumed is attached).

Pertinent also is a rigmarole in the *Historia Augusta* concerning Aurelian. It is alleged (*Aur.* 50.4) that that emperor *delectatus est fagone* (or *phagone) qui usque eo multum comedit* (the inevitable details of what was eaten make up the rest of the passage).

It is patent that Greek words such as *polyphagus* were a regular feature of Latin accounts of feats of gluttony. The epithet in question is not restricted to Suetonius, nor to Egyptian contexts. And nowhere is there any hint of the presence of a crocodile.

[1] *CGL* 7.232.

Such words were perhaps employed because they imported a suitably exotic, non-Roman colour to these unappetising anecdotes. One is seduced into thinking of starveling Easterners. In both of the entries cited above, the Chronographer asserts that the glutton was *adhuc esuriens* at the end of his Gargantuan efforts: a conscious echo of Juvenal's *Graeculus esuriens?*

Professor Georg Luck has suggested to me that these *polyphagi* were a kind of circus artist who could swallow virtually anything without chewing it; on exhibition like modern sword or fire swallowers, they will have attracted imperial attention. This attractive notion may be supported by the statement of the Chronographer that Alexander Severus' creature performed at least partly in public: *ebibit vini grecanicum plenum et venit ad templum Iasurae et ebibit labrum plenum et adhuc esuriens esse videbatur.* The fact that most of the Chronographer's entries relate to imperial largesses or shows is also suggestive. Suetonius' item affords no clue. The anecdote in the *HA* does state specifically that Aurelian's pet glutton performed *ante mensam eius*, but this need not weaken the theory since it will be shown later that the item is very probably a fabrication. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to believe that these gluttons performed both in public and privately for imperial pleasure.

Alternatively, *polyphagus* and cognates could be treated as proper names or nicknames, and printed accordingly in modern texts. The procedure involved makes obvious sense. In the case of *polyphagus*, it might be thought abetted by the existence of a tribe called Polyphagoi.[2] As to the aforementioned passage in the *HA*, there is a marginal note in one of the manuscripts explaining *fagone* as *proprium nomen mimi edacis*.[3] We do not have to believe this to see that later scribes did not think of crocodiles in these gluttonous contexts.

Littman's claim that *polyphagus* is unique to Suetonius is wrong; and the Chronographer proves the existence of a human glutton in the time of Nero. The traditional rendering of *polyphagus* is thus vindicated, unless all this evidence is dis-

[2] Strabo 11.506C (a tribe of the Northern Caucasus).

[3] See the *apparatus* to Hohl's Teubner; Hohl himself registered Fago in his *index nominum*, albeit adding that he would prefer to read *fago*.

carded on the grounds that later writers got it all wrong as well. Even that avenue seems blocked by some further considerations.

First, crocodiles were synonymous with Egypt in Roman eyes. For Suetonius (or any Roman) to write *polyphago cuidam Aegypti generis* seems impossibly otiose, if not downright tautological, if the word means crocodile.

Second, the Romans associated cannibalism with Egyptians. One naturally thinks of Juvenal's poem on the subject. Other cases can be adduced. Dio Cassius, for instance, describes an episode in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (71.4.1).

Next, although Nero might reasonably be assumed to have a private crocodile, it is worth noting that exhibitions of these beasts in Rome are attested only for the reigns of Augustus, Domitian, Pius, and Elagabalus.[4]

Then, despite the celebrated accounts of Roman tourists watching the sacred crocodiles in Egypt, the animal was not specially famous for polyphagy. Indeed, on occasion, the reverse was true. Symmachus was to find this out rather painfully. He spent money on importing crocodiles to Rome, only to see them go on a hunger strike for fifty days and then expire.[5]

Finally, inspection of Greek texts discloses that the adjective in question tends to be associated with cannibalism. There is a notable passage in Athenaeus (415C) where it is used to describe Cambles, the Lydian king who ate his own wife one night.

In view of all this, it is reasonable to reject the suggestion of Littman and retain the traditional meaning. A final word on the passage from the *HA* earlier adduced. The Chronographer for the Year 354 was devoted to the reporting of feats of gluttony and other *mirabilia*.[6] However, this author has no such item to record under Aurelian. It is a fair bet, then, that the anecdote

[4] Dio Cassius 55.10.8; Martial 5.65.13; *HA, Pius* 10.9; *HA, Elag.* 28.3. Cf. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners* (sixth edit., transl. by A. B. Gough) IV, 185; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Animals in Roman Life and Art* (London 1973) 218-20.

[5] Symmachus, *Epp.* 6.43; 9.141, 151.

[6] E.g., the *mula hominem comedit* entry under Gordian.

in the *HA* is a fabrication, inspired by the biographer's reading, with *fagone* clearly seeing service as a variant on the Suetonian *polyphago*.

LXXIII

CRIME AND CRIMINALS IN GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT

The general Roman attitude towards conquered Egypt was notoriously one of suspicion and contempt. There is no need to repeat the famous passages; the sophisticated sneers of Virgil, the cold and succinct summary by Tacitus of Egypt as Augustus found and left it, and the alleged violence and cannibalism depicted by Juvenal are known to all. Implicit in all these is the idea that Egypt was a country riddled with crime and corruption of every sort. Seneca actually says that Egyptian criminals were proverbial in his day; judging by his phraseology, Egypt occupied the place of modern Chicago in popular estimation (1). As they stand, the literary accounts seen too standardised and highly coloured to win credence. However, thanks to the evidence of the papyri, it is possible to confirm or refute the writers. This aspect of Egyptian life has been touched on by modern scholars, but only cursorily in large textbooks (2). The subject matter is so fascinating that it seems worthwhile to describe and analyse a representative number of cases, and to attempt some general remarks and conclusion. This paper deliberately includes Ptolemaic and Byzantine Egypt for reasons which will become apparent in my conclusions. I exclude cases of corruption and extortion amongst the officials governing the country; these are too familiar to require any sort of treatment. Omitted also are cases of peasant revolt (such as the outbreak under Marcus Aurelius) and the desertions of villages by desperate taxpayers. These I consider be social problems and human

---

(1) *Epistles*, 51. 13: « latronum more, quos φιλήτας Aegyptii vocant, in hoc nos amplectuntur, ut strangulent » Mr. G. R. Watson of Nottingham University pointed out to me that this text is often printed without reference to the fact that φιλήτας is an emendation by Muretus for the « stillistas » of the *MSS*. He suggests στηλιτάς which has authority as meaning « posted or placarded up as infamous ». The sense of the passage, of course, is unaffected.

(2) J. G. Milne, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, (3rd. edit., 1924), pps. 166/7; J. G. Winter, *Life and Letters in the Papyri*, University of Michigan (1933), pps. 109/117. I have also consulted R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the light of the Papyri*, (2nd. edit., Warsaw 1955), pps. 429 ff. I use the conventional abbreviations for the collections of Papyri refered to.

tragedies. I restrict myself to activities that to both ancient and modern can only be regarded as criminal.

The best attested crime in the papyri is theft. This took many forms, naturally. We can single out housebreaking as a frequent feature. The ancient Egyptian burglar was a cool and resourceful character. A case in 185 B. C. records that a house was entered at night and ransacked whilst the owners slept on in blissful ignorance (P.Tebt. 796). They must have worked in efficient silence. Not all were so adept or so lucky. An anonymous householder of c. 112 B. C. writes: « On the night before the 5th. of Phamenoth, certain persons found their way into my house by force and, having undermined the doorpost, entered the vestibule. I woke up and shouted for help . . . » (P.Tebt. 804). We curse the fate that broke off the papyrus at this exciting point! Other intruders preferred to take advantage of the absence of the owner. Hence the unfortunate Ptolemaeus(midsecond century A. D.) returned home to find « everything gone » (P.Tebt. 330). Housebreakers had no scruples in this respect, as the following example shows. A certain Soterichus, in 176 A. D., complains: « Some people made a thievish attack on my house on the night of the 22nd. of the month Athur, taking advantage of my absence on account of my mourning for my daughter's husband. After removing the nails from the doors, they carried off all that I had stored in the house ». (P.Tebt. 332). Very often the householder got short shrift if he did detect the culprits. Here is the lament of the hapless Akous (131 A.D.): « They, a group of brothers and associates, made a bold attack on my house and, when I argued with them, belaboured me with blows on every limb, and carried off a white tunic and robe, a cloak, a pair of scissors, beer, a quantity of salt, and other things which I do not at present know ». (P.Tebt. 331). Housebreakers did not care to come quietly when tracked down. In 48 A. D. a certain Papontos, who tells us that he was 45 with a scar on the left side of his nose below the eyebrow, found 10 wooden beams stolen from his house. He took a policeman and found some of the beams in the house of Patunion; the accused promptly hit Papontos and seriously wounded a child Papontos was carrying. (Michigan Papyri V, 230-from Tebtunis). We are permitted to wonder at the mentality of the criminal who would hit a child, but even more so at a man who would take a child in arms on an attempted arrest of a burglar! Occasionally a theft is the consequence of carelessness on the part of the general public; such was the case of the woman Diemous in 144 A. D. who left a box containing

gold bracelets and a gold statuette of a goddess on her terrace, and then complained because her neighbours had rifled it (P.Oxy. 1272). Perhaps the most colourful case is that recorded in 190 A. D.. The petitioner complains: « They broke through a window which overlooks a public street and which had been blocked up with bricks, probably using a log as a battering ram against the place. Then they entered the house through this window and carried away 10 artabae of barley. It is inferred that this was let down piecemeal through the said window from the traces of the rope upon it. » (P.Oxy. 69). Some neat detective work here. Finally, 2 cases from Byzantine Egypt. A woman is said to have stolen property from a church and then to have been protected by the Headman of the village of Kegethis where she had taken refuge (P.Oxy. 1832; 5/6th. century). This hints at a sectarian religious or inter-village dispute as background. The other case is very instructive. It dates from the 6th. century, and is evidence formally given by a witness. The witness declares that he, along with the accused, was admitted at a late hour into the Convent of Ama Juliana. With the collusion of some of the inmates the accused smuggled out a piece of the Convent's silver plate which was then broken up and disposed of to a silversmith who made spoons of it (P.Oxy. 2419). There are several points of interest here. The witness seems to have turned State's Evidence to save his own skin. The standard of morality on the part of certain Convent inmates is hardly beyond reproach. The silversmith clearly filled the role of the modern « fence » and may have had a regular trade.

Along with the housebreaker we find the common footpad, thug, and highwayman. These gentry were equally bold and ruthless, and very catholic in their choice of goods. A document of 183 B. C. lists a mill, 3 young sheep, a black donkey, and 2 beasts of burden as being stolen in 3 separate attacks (P.Tebt. 793). In the same century a priest was attacked and robbed whilst actually engaged in religious rites (P.Tebt. 797). A Sitologus was robbed and attacked at the Public Baths, by bath attendants of all people, and he only just escaped alive (P.Tebt. 798). In 143 B. C. one Demetrius of Heracleopolis was so brazen as to steal 2 cloaks and a tunic by force in the actual presence of Apollonius the guard (P.Tebt. 733). One wonders whether Apollonius was in collusion or just discreet. It is not improbable that police officials could de « fixed » by ancient gangsters. There is another case which suggests this. In the reign of Claudius, a certain man was robbed of 2 white donkeys. The plaintiff and the village police chief

gave chase to another district, but they were prevented from arresting the thieves by the police and guards of this district who locked up the plaintiff and the police chief for 3 days and, for good measure, beat up the plaintiff (P.Karan. 421). We know for certain that local gansters succeeded in making use of soldiers and armed force to carry out their nefarious schemes. A series of petitions to Menches the komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris, in 113 B. C., from cultivators of crown land, complain of a number of armed robberies, all on the same day, committed by a gang of thugs led by Pyrrichus a cavalry soldier under the orders of Heracleus a native of Kerkeosiris (P.Tebt. 45, 46, 47). Highway robbery is well illustrated by the unhappy experience that befell the pig merchants Pasion and Onesimus in 171 A. D.. They were attacked at dawn on the road between Polydeucia and Theadelphia; along with the guard of the watch tower, who seems to have been honest though ineffectual, they were assaulted, tied up, and robbed of one pig and a tunic (P.Fayum 108).

Crimes of violence abound. Many of course arose out of the above cases, such as assaults and desperate violence by thieves seeking to avoid arrest or to incapacitate their victims. Actual murders are not common in the papyri, though of course we have to allow for assaults which were un successful murders, and for the possibility that some of our attested victims of assault died after they had registered their complaints. A certain Heras, in 114 B. C., was ordered to be brought for trial for murder and other offences by Menches (see above for this official) (P.Tebt. 14). In 124 A. D. a certain Stotoetis accused 4 men of murdering his brother, but at the actual trial his prosecution witnesses (including 2 women) admitted or claimed ignorance of the whole affair (P.Amherst 66). It is hard to resist the conclusion that these witnesses had been intimidated by the defence. We do have another case where intimidation of a plaintiff is certain. In 103 BC one Theotimus was attacked, robbed, and assaulted in his own house by a Persian named Diocles whom he had previously summonsed « for various injuries » (P.Fayum 12). Reverting to murder cases, we have an attempted poisoning in 118 B. C., though the defendants were acquitted (P.Tebt. 43). One or two papyri drop sinister hints. In 216 A. D. the worried **Aurelia** Tisais reports her father and son missing on a hunting expedition and says that she suspects foul play (P.Tebt. 333). From c. 170 B. C. comes this report by a police official: « On the 5th. of this month, when patrolling the fields near the village, I found an effusion of blood (the words ' but no body ' appear in the text at

this point but are deleted by the same or another hand) and I learn from the villagers that Theodotus, son of Dositheus, having set out in that direction, has not yet returned » (P.Tebt. 730).

Some of the attested assaults probably arose out of old grudges or lost tempers; we must remember that we usually have only one side of every case. In 48 A. D. one Petsiris complains that he was beaten up by Patunion whom he found driving a mule through his newly planted vegetables (Michigan Papyri V 229, from Tebtunis). That was certainly adding insult to injury. Just as flagrant was the assault on poor Hermon (31 A. D.) by a group of men whom he found fishing on his property without his permission (P.Oxy. 2234). Sheer hooliganism was probably responsible for one Sourous being tossed into the dock in 509 A. D. after sustaining a blow on the head (P.Oxy. 1885), whereas Isidorus the field watchman of Karanis, who is said by an official medical report of 300 A. D. to have severe cudgel wounds upon his arms and shoulder, may have met his injuries in the couse of his work (Merton Papyri II. 89). Most fascinating of all is the fact that a very large number of assault cases feature women as the culprits. Unhappy indeed was the fate of a certain Tryphon. In c. 35 A. D. he was deserted and robbed by his first wife Demetrious, in probable collusion with her mother. In 37 A. D. he complains that these two formidable ladies have assaulted his second wife whilst pregnant, and in 50 A. D. he and his wife are again mauled by a woman and other persons unknown (P.Oxy. 282, 315, 324). In 142 B.C. Sabbataeus the Jew had alleged that his pregnant wife was attacked by a woman named Joanna (P.Tebt. 800). In 350 A. D. Aurelia Thaesis was kicked and punched by her sister-in-law Rhia and husband who were living with her (P.Amherst 141). A happy household! In the third century A. D. the formidable Didyme, wife of the cook Agathos Daimon, unleashed a flood of Billingsgate upon the former exhibitor of games in Oxyrhyncus, Aurelius by name, and then proceeded to attack him and some bystanders when he protested (P.Osl. 1482) (1). From the reing of Euergetes comes the report of a witness of a first class fight between 2 women at a very wild party, in which our witness seens to have been dangerously involved (P.Hibeh 200). The most bizarre of all is the following, which will be familiar to the readers of Juvenal on the perils of living in Rome: « To King Ptolemaeus, greeting. I have

(1) Published by S. Eitrem and Leiv Amundsen in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 40, 1954, pps. 30 ff.

been unjustly treated by Psenobastis, who lives in Psya in the division of Heraclides. For in the 4th. year, on Phamenoth 21, I went to Psya on private business. An Egyptian woman, whose name is said to be Psenobastis, having leaned from the upper story emptied a chamber pot into the street so that I was soaked. And when I became angered and reproved her, Psenobastis pulled at my himation with her right hand and uncovered my breast, and spat in my face. I have witnesses to prove this and that I have been the victim of an unjust assault ». (P.Lille II. 24). A veritable virago!

Other crimes are attested. Smuggling and Black Market activities are winked at by most private citizens, but are of concern to the relevant authorities. In 113 B. C. an oil-seller by the name of Apollororus complained that his trade was ruined by an unnamed Thracian who was selling contraband oil at the house of Petesouchos the leather-seller. An official search found the Thracian but no oil. Later, oil was found secreted in hides and sheepskins belonging to Petesouchos. The Thracian escaped. The same Apollodorus also had this trouble with a certain Sisais and his wife Tausiris who were storing illicit oil in their house. After he had tried to search their house, Apollodorus was attacked with his wife by a gang led by Pausiris the brother of Sisais. Obviously many people stood to gain by these activities (P.Tebt. 38, 39). Smugglers were the most likely culprits in the raid, in 135 B. C., on the anchored State Barge, whose gear was sabotaged and watchman assaulted (P.Tebt. 802). From the third century A. D. we have a document authorising the search of ships suspected of carrying contraband (P.Oxy. 36).

Disputes over land rights are naturally common. One case illustrates a theme dear to the makers of Western films, and deserves citation; it dates from 120 A. D.: « A certain Horion ... in contempt of our easy temper has first of all hindered us from making use of the village irrigator, and not only this, but when we got water from other sources, persecuted us to remove us from this also ... he is trying to seize 2 arourae of our crown land to make it his private property and, having overbid us for land once ours he lets it to strangers, intending that our beasts shall be destroyed » (P.Oxy. 2410).

Abduction of women is not unknown. A widow of the third century A. D. alleges that her slave girl Theodora was forcibly abducted from her home by the curator of Seuthes, Thomis (P.Oxy. 1120); a letter of the sixth century speaks of the abduction of one Macaria (P.Oxy. 1837). We cannot be sure whether these were the actions of

white slavers or paramours, but in view of the prevalence of the traffic in women attested in the reign of Justinian we may fairly be suspicious.

Finally, the frequency of inter-village feuds and battles must be noted. The papyri do not confirm the gruesome cannibalism alleged by Juvenal in his 15th. Satire, but they speak eloquently of organised raids on villages by their neighbours, of theft and violence as results and objects of such raids. These incidents occur with increasing frequency in the later Roman and Byzantine periods (e. g., P.Oxy. 1831, 1853, 1866, 1867, 1873, 2233, which span the 4th. and 6th. centuries).

What conclusions can we draw from these sordid, yet fascinating details of the seamy side in Egypt? In some respects disappointment is a first reaction. Our papyri are scattered and it seems impossible to piece together connected biographies of individual criminals. Identity of name is meaningless. Nor can we safely designate particular areas as unusually tough or lawless. Yet the comment of Seneca seems justified. Egyptian criminals were bold, resourceful, and quite ruthless, worthy heirs of the tomb robbing traditions of Pharoahonic Egypt. They worked individually, or in gangs. They could and did bride police and officials, and were prone to intimidate witnesses against them. They anticipated a good many refinements of the modern criminal. The stringent penalties prescribed for their crimes seem not to have deterred them. The gangster's Moll, in one form or another, is with us here, as is the damsel in distress. We see the nocturnal footpad, the pure thug, the relatively innocuous smuggler, the arrogant poacher, the mysterious bloodstains in the field. As Winter (1) says: « we have here the fabric of life itself in these narratives of personal tribulation. ». Doubtless this prevalence of crime in Egypt can be used to interpret and prove the shortcomings of that society and the administration. On this point I issue three general warnings.

We should not assume that the Egyptian was far more vicious than anyone else in the Roman Empire. Crime in Rome,or in later Constantinople, must have been about as violent and as wide spread, and if we had the evidence for the other provinces the picture might become more balanced. The Senecan charge is valid, but the analogy with Chicago holds: despite the film industry we do not judge America by Al Capone or the Kefauver Report.

(1) *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

It is hardly fair to impute all the blame for the ills of Egypt to Augustus and the Roman administration, as many scholars tend to do (1). They may have drained the country economically, but they were faced with the appalling legacy of ignorance, corruption, and poverty from the Pharoahs, and some writers have been a little too generous in overlooking the deficiencies of Ptolemaic rule (2). It is clear from my examples that crime was just as rampant in Ptolemaic times.

Last, though many will regret this, the advent of Christianity had little effect on public and private behaviour. The Convent Burglary and the increase in intervillage battles indicate that a change in religion by the state does not change the hearts and minds of men. The Egyptian criminal, who is really human frailty in vivid microcosm, is the same whether the Pharoah be his ruler, or the Ptolemy, or the Roman Emperor across the sea, or the Christian monarch in Rome or Constantinople.

(1) J. G. Milne, *The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement*, in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 17, 1927, pps. 1-13; M. Rostovtzeff, *Roman Exploitation of Egypt in the First Century A. D.* in *Journal of Economic and Business History*, I. 1929, pps. 337-364. For the fullest details see *Roman Egypt*, by A. C. Johnson (= *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Vol. II, 1959).

(2) Especially Milne, art. cit.

LXXIV

STRIKES IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

May I add a little further information to Ramsay MacMullen's excellent *A note on Roman strikes* (*CJ* 58 [1963] 269ff.)?

In the second century A.D., we may note examples of the common modern phenomenon of the professional strike agitator. These came out of the ranks of the Cynic philosophers; in this period, the Cynics were at the apogee of their popularity (and unpopularity, for that matter) as men who preached drastic social revolution and who were prepared to back up their inflammatory words with deeds. Our source here is Lucian, a writer who disliked many Cynics on personal grounds (notably Peregrinus Proteus) but who had much sympathy for the conditions of many of the masses which made them responsive to agitators. In his dialogue *Fugitivi*[1] he describes the poverty of various trades which forces many of their practitioners to abandon them and become itinerant "philosophers."[2] These newly-made Cynics then wander around various provinces of the Empire (Thrace in this instance), provoking other workers to "down tools" and follow them.[3] Lucian implies that all the workers so persuaded became Cynic philosophers, but he exaggerates for the sake of effect, and it is reasonable to suppose that many workers were inspired to organize brief stoppages of work for definite purposes, and return to work on the granting of specific demands. In this sense it is fair to use the word "strike." Cynics of this period are often involved in bread riots, which were the commonest and most spontaneous demonstrations of mass industrial protest (though bread riots can be and often were organized). A bread riot is not synonymous with a strike, but men who are rioting are not working, and the bread riot is a symptom of the same social

1. Composed almost certainly at Philippopolis in 165/6. It postludes the *Peregrinus*, and continues Lucian's ridicule of that worthy.

2. It may be significant that the trades specified are those of cobbler, builder, fuller, and wool worker. In *Fugitivi* 13 these are described: *hai téchnai dè glíschrai kaì sun póno·i kaì mógis hikanà paréchein edúnanto.*

3. *Fugitivi 17: hoi gàr ek tôn·n ergaste·río·n hápantes anape dé santes eré·mous tàs téchnas eásousin . . . .*

malaise. It is fair to point out that the Cynic most admired by Lucian, Demonax at Athens, is praised for quelling rioters on various occasions.[4]

Events in Roman Egypt should never be taken as typical, but it is important to point out that the despairing *anachoreseis* or mass desertions of their villages by the fellahin were emulated in Roman North Africa. A notable example of this is the threatened uprising by the tenants of the *Saltus Burunitanus* in the reign of Commodus.[5] MacMullen mentions the Gallic *Bacaudae*; to these I add the *Circumcelliones* who, to the protracted anguish of Augustine, were drawn into the struggle between the Donatists and the Catholic Church in North Africa in the fourth and fifth centuries. And finally, in this same religious context, in the year 362, at Hippo a Donatist leader organized a strike by sympathetic bakers against the Catholic gentry.[6] This is a very early example of the modern technique of fomenting industrial unrest to promote individual or party ends.

4. *Demonax 9: kaí pou kaì dé mois tarattoménois emmelô s dieléchthe· kaì tous pleístous autô·n épeisen hupourgeîn tê·i patrídi tà métria.*

5. The date is ca. 183/5. The text can be read in Dessau 6870.

6. Augustine, *Contra litteras Petiliani* 2.83.184: Faustinum vestrum regni sui tempore, quoniam catholicorum ibi paucitas erat, praecepisse ut nullus eis panem coqueret.

LXXV

GERMAINE GREER AND THE FEMALE ARTISTS OF GREECE AND ROME

There is very little about the women artists of antiquity in either the text or index of *The Obstacle Race.*[1] A neglect which extends to the writings of feminist classical scholars.[2] Which is a pity. For the evidence, though small, is clear and encouraging.

The *locus classicus* is Pliny, *Natural History* 35. 147-7. Miss Greer, perhaps misled by Cristoforo Landino's edition (Florence, 1476 - the only one she cites), badly misrepresents it. As evidence for this claim, and for the reader's convenience, I here append the Latin text and an English version.[3]

> Pinxere et mulieres: Timarete, Miconis filia, Dianam, quae in tabula Ephesi est antiquissimae picturae; Irene, Cratini pictoris filia et discipula, puellam, quae est Eleusine, Calypso, senem et praestigiatorem Theodorum, Alcisthenen saltatorem; Aristarete, Nearchi filia et discipula, Aesculapium. Iaia Cyzicena, perpetua virgo, M. Varronis iuventa Romae et penicillo pinxit et cestro in ebore imagines mulierum maxime et Neapoli anum in grandi tabula, suam quoque imaginem ad speculum. nec ullius velocior in pictura manus fuit, artis vero tantum, ut multum manipretiis antecederet celeberrimos eadem aetate imaginum pictores Sopolim et Dionysium, quorum tabulae pinacothecas implent. pinxit et quaedam Olympias, de qua hoc solum memoratur, discipulum eius fuisse Autobulum.

> "There have also been women artists--Timarete the daughter of Micon who painted the extremely archaic panel picture of Artemis at Ephesus, Irene daughter and pupil of the painter Cratinus who did the Maiden at Eleusis, a Calypso, an Old Man and Theodorus the Juggler, and painted also Alcisthenes the Dancer; Aristarete the daughter and pupil of Nearchus, who painted an Asclepius. When Marcus Varro was a young man, Iaia of Cyzicus, who never married, painted pictures with the brush at Rome (and also drew with the *cestrum* or graver on ivory), chiefly portraits of women, as well as a large picture on wood of an Old Woman at Naples, and also a portrait of herself, done with a looking-glass. No one else had a quicker hand in painting, while her artistic skill was such that in the prices she obtained she far outdid the most celebrated portrait painters of the same period, Sopolis and Dionysius, whose pictures fill the galleries. A certain Olympias also painted; the only fact recorded about her is that Autobulus was her pupil."

Miss Greer claims[4] that Pliny categorises these female painters "among all the other freakish circumstances, most of them imaginary." Nothing of the kind. The subject is introduced quite neutrally: *pinxere et mulieres.* And the item is put in its logical position, directly after Pliny's register of male artists. There is nothing to suggest that he disbelieved in the existence of the women. Indeed, he hardly could have here, for one of his sources of information was the Hellenistic historian Duris of Samos, a writer notable for his interest in women.[5] Furthermore, when Pliny regards something as unusual, he draws explicit attention to it. Witness, in the present context, his comment[6] on the double novelty of the left-handed gentleman amateur, Turpilius: *postea non est spectata honestis manibus, nisi forte quis Turpilium equitem Romanum e Venetia nostrae aetatis velit referre pulchris eius operibus hodieque Veronae exstantibus. laeva is manu pinxit, quod de nullo ante memoratur* ("Since then, painting has not been honoured by men of birth, unless we except in our own time the knight Turpilius from Venetia, whose very good pictures can been seen even today at Verona. He painted with his left hand, a phenomenon unparalleled before him").

Miss Greer gives the names of the women thus: Timarete, Helena, Aristarete, Lala, Marsia, Olympia. A glance at the Latin text will disclose how inaccurate this register is. Helena should be Irene; Lala is in reality Iaia;[7] Olympia should strictly be Olympias; and Marsia should not be there at all. She recurs three times in *The Obstacle Race*,[8] once usurping the credit that belongs to Iaia for painting a self-portrait with the aid of a mirror. Alas, Marsia is an aberration, being only a scribe's incorrect expansion of M. in the manuscripts of Pliny.[9] By way of compensation, it is possible that Marsia can be replaced by Calypso: the text does not make it clear whether she is a subject of Irene's painting or an artist in her own right.[10]

Painting is the female talent. Pliny reports no women sculptors. He does, however, acknowledge[11] that Boutades, the inventor of clay modelling, was helped to this discovery by the artistic talents of his daughter. This correlation of talents between father and daughter is also manifest in the cases of Timarete, Irene, and Aristarete. It may throw a suggestive and pleasing light on the willingness of at least some ancient fathers to recognise and assist the artistic bent in their daughters. Pliny also mentions twice[12] the case of Glykera. She not only invented flower wreaths, but by her artistic skills and enthusiasms inspired her artist boy-friend Pausias to develop the art of encaustic painting. Here we have a clear example of an erotic and intellectual relationship in which the woman is acknowledged as the equal of the man.[13]

This notion of equality is also central to the argument of Plutarch in his essay *On The Bravery of Women.* In his prefatory statement[14] on the appropriateness of comparing female courage to male, he significantly bolsters his case by maintaining that no one would object to the assertion that paintings by woman are the equal of paintings by men. As with Pliny, there is no suggestion that female artists are freakish or imaginary.

Lack of evidence precludes any clear assessment of the female achievement in painting in Greece and Rome. Miss Greer, however, seems unaware of what little archaeological evidence there is. On a mixing bowl from Athens, a scene depicting work in a potter's shop shows a woman painting a vase in the company of four men. This is an apparent case of a free woman earning a living in what are nowadays called the industrial arts.[15] So may be the Pompeian fresco of a woman painting a statue. By contrast, another Pompeian picture in which a lady is sitting at an easel may disclose someone for whom art was a hobby, not a job.[16]

A final, and intriguing, piece of evidence is provided centuries later by the Byzantine hagiographer John of Ephesus.[17] He alludes to a poor widow who lived from art and who gave art lessons for money to young girls. This tidbit of information is both precious and frustrating. Does a woman teaching girls betoken artistic apartheid? Or may it have led to a distinctive "feminist" school?

Miss Greer ends her book by explaining the absence of a female Leonardo or Titian this: "The reason is simply that you cannot make great artists out of egos that have been damaged, with wills that are defective, with libidos that have been defective, with libidos that have been driven out of reach and energy diverted into neurotic channels." This bleak picture can and should be tempered by considering Iaia, one of Pliny's female artists. Her technical innovations and artistic skills brought her both fame and fortune. She outdid male artists: the comparison is not just with other women. It is clear that no one damaged the ego of this woman; and Pliny's testimony to her speed of production attests to the strength of her will. As for her libido, Pliny describes her as *perpetua virgo*, which certainly implies that she never married but does not necessarily mean that she remained a virgin. Iaia furnished at least one clearcut classical example of a "liberated lady" who both challenged and outstripped her male competitors.

NOTES

[1]Germaine Greer, *The Obstacle Race* (London, 1979), cited hereafter by page reference alone.

[2]For notable instance, Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves* (London, 1976), ignores the issue. Nor is there anything in the articles and bibliographies comprising the two special Women in Antiquity issues of the classical journal *Arethusa* (6 [Spring 1973]; 11 [Spring/Fall 1978]). The Pliny passage is noted and accepted as valid evidence by Mary F. Lefkowitz & Maureen Fant, *Women in Greece and Rome* (Toronto, 1977), 180-81, albeit they adduce none of the other items discussed in the present paper.

[3]The Latin text is that of C. Mayhoff's Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1892); the English version follows H. Rackham's Loeb translation.

[4]P. 2.

[5]For Duris of Samos, and Pliny's other sources, see K. Jex-Blake and E. Seller *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art* (repr. Chicago, 1968), xlvi-lxvii.

[6]*NH* 35. 20.

[7]See the *apparatus criticus* to Mayhoff's text. Iaia has been emended to Laia or Maia; Lala is an impossible name.

[8]Pp. 69, 72, 160-1.

[9]Again, see Mayhoff's apparatus; *M.* of course stands for *Marci*, being part of Varro's name.

[10]Mayhoff's text makes her an artist, Rackham's a subject; both scholars admit the ambiguity.

[11]*NH* 35. 151; the anecdote is reproduced by Athenagoras, *De legatione* 17.

[12]*NH* 21. 4; 35. 125.

[13]To which might be compared the case of the Byzantine princess and historian, Anna Comnena; her husband, Nicephorus Bryennius, was also an historian. A nice ancient anticipation of Will and Ariel Durant, or of the Longford family of historians in England.

[14]*Moralia* 243B, a passage Miss Greer ought to find encouraging.

[15]For the vase, see J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* (Oxford, 1963), p. 571, no. 73. The woman's hair style suggests that she was free, not servile; cf. W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (London, 1968), p. 185.

[16]For the two Pompeian paintings, see H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei den Griechen und Römern*. (Leipzig, 1875-87), vol iii, p. 226; vol. iv, p. 460.

[17]*Lives of the Eastern Saints, Patrologia Orientalis* 17, vol. i, pp. 15-16.

ROMAN LITERATURE

LXXVI

BOS PIGER OR *PIGER CABALLUS*?

PROFESSOR Huxley's article on '*Bos*, Bentley, and Byron'[1] was delightful to read; it provokes these thoughts of mine.

Majority opinion proves nothing, but it is solidly on the side of *bos piger*. Kiessling, for instance, and F. Villeneuve (in his 1967 Budé text) place the comma after *piger*. So do Lewis and Short, the *TLL*, the compilers of the new *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, and Dominicus Bo in his *Lexicon Horatianum*. Acron, Pseudo-Acron, and Porphyrion offer no comment. *Piger* is attached to *caballus* by Lane Cooper,[2] and rather hesitantly by A. S. Wilkins.[3] The latter felt that this better fitted the general sense of Horace's argument, a point to which I recur later. Wilkins was less confident of the rhythm of the line as a pointer to the ascription, and mentioned that many (unspecified) editors took *piger* as going with both nouns; this, indeed, might be an attractive compromise.

Huxley has given Bentley a fair enough hearing, and I have nothing to add on Byron, save that I am equally sure that it was the Horace line which had stuck in his mind, and that his use of *bos piger* proves nothing at all.

There is a case for *piger caballus*. Petronius[4] has the expression *tanquam caballus in clivo*, which looks proverbial enough to reinforce the image of the nag. Perhaps more to the point, since we are dealing with Horace, is the Lucilian *taetri tardique caballi*.[5] *Piger caballus* could be an echo of the earlier satirist.

On one point, I would disagree with Huxley. He sees a sharp contrast between the Greek word *ephippia* and *caballus* ('aggressively and crudely Roman'). I think the two animals make the obvious and logical contrast: the sturdy, monosyllabic *bos* and the flightier, less respectable *caballus*. The animals and their whims counterpoint each other.

The crucial problem is, surely, what precise meaning to attach to *piger*. If it means 'lazy', the adjective might seem to fit *caballus* better, for the *bos* could not normally be thought of as an indolent creature (there can, of course, be individual *boves* who are lazy, but Horace is making a generic point). The aforementioned tags from Petronius and Lucilius may be adduced again to indicate the reputation of the *caballus*.

[1] H. H. Huxley, *G & R* xix, 2 (October, 1972), 187 ff.
[2] *Concordance to Horace* (Washington, 1916).
[3] In his Macmillan edition of the *Epistles* (London, 1883), 181.
[4] *Sat.* 134. 2.
[5] Frag. 163 Marx (= 161 Krenkel).

We will then, of course, be asked why a lazy nag would want to switch to ploughing, not a logical ambition for a lethargic beast. This, to be sure, may be precisely the point of the line!

If *piger* has the force of 'slow-moving' or 'sluggish', it might better fit the *bos*, who with the best will in the world is rendered *piger* by the plough. The beast might then naturally yearn for the lighter weight of the *ephippium*, which was less burdensome than a regular saddle.

All the arguments run in vicious circles, and the matter will have to be reduced to subjective taste. As indicated, *piger caballus* might simply echo Lucilius' *tardi caballi*. On the other hand, if the *caballus* has the proverbial reputation of laziness, *piger* might appear too otiose for Horace to have written. Huxley's comment that the dactylic nature of the line 'perfectly represents the trotting of the horse' is not conclusive, for Romans clearly did not expect a *caballus* to trot, ploughing or not. The rhythm might, instead, be an Horatian joke: accommodating sound to an unaccommodating sense.

And so on. Frankly, I see no way of deciding which of the animals should accept the epithet. It must depend on how much weight one is prepared to attach to the Lucilian phrase as Horace's possible linguistic inspiration, to the proverbial reputation of the *caballus*, to the precise connotation of *piger*, and to Horace's sense of, not only rhythm, but also humour.

LXXVII

VERGIL, ECLOGUE IV.61: A REPLY

Mr. Kinzler objects to the systole in the line *matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses*. Needlessly. Vergil has a parallel in *Aen.* 2.774: *obstipui, steteruntque comae et vox faucibus haesit*. Horace has at least two: *Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae* (*Serm.* 1.10.45), and *di tibi divitias dederunt artemque fruendi* (*Epist.* 1.4.7). Lucretius has the systole in his only two uses of *dederunt*: *assiduas dederunt operas, plerumque videmus* (4.947), and *et primae dederunt solacia dulcia vitae* (6.4).

Manuscript variants carry no weight. As Wilkins notes (on Horace, *Epist.* 1.4.7), the pluperfect form usually occurs in lesser manuscripts. Nor do Kinzler's statistics on the position of the forms of *fero* and compounds do anything for his argument. In the line under discussion, Vergil has obviously placed *tulerunt* medially in order to make a *versus aureus* (the verb separating two adjectives from the nouns they qualify; on this technique see H. H. Huxley on *Georg.* 1.8).

Kinzler's suggestion that *tulerint* would be more suitable to the atmosphere of the predicted birth has little warrant. The mother is in a protracted state of pregnancy, and the ten long months have already resulted in pain. In the preceding line, the child is ordered to come forth and change the mother's labour into joy (*incipe, parve puer, risu cognoscere matrem*). The perfect tense is surely required.

LXXVIII

THE DEATH OF CLEOPATRA VII

In his article on this subject (*JEA* 47 (1961), 113–18), J. Gwyn Griffiths adduces various classical authors for his belief that Cleopatra used two snakes instead of one for her suicide. I should like to challenge some of his interpretations and assumptions.

His first passage is from Virgil's description of the Battle of Actium. He cites *Aen.* 8, 697: *necdum etiam geminos a tergo respicit angues*. He objects to the view of Henry, which he seems to know only from T. L. Page's note, that the *angues gemini* are a regular symbol of death and do not refer specifically to Cleopatra's suicide. He notes *en passant* that Henry had adduced parallel passages from the *Aeneid*, but does not cite them; instead he hastens to claim that 'the glaring objection to all this is the fact that Virgil's adjacent lines refer to the sistrum, to *omnigenum deum monstra*, and to *latrator Anubis*. An Egyptian allusion is plainly demanded in *geminos angues*.' He is far too eager to prove his point. The first of Henry's parallels was *Aen.* 2, 203–4, which refers to the *gemini angues* that came out of the sea to destroy Laocoon at Troy. Henry's other main parallel is *Aen.* 7, 450, describing the vision sent to Turnus by Allecto. Here the hideous vision has *geminos angues*; what is more, Turnus is ordered to gaze upon the horrid spectacle by the imperative *respice*, the same verb as that used in the first Cleopatra passage. This triple repetition of *gemini angues* is surely significant. They all presage doom, for Laocoon and Troy, for Turnus and his clan, for Cleopatra and Egypt. Virgil deliberately uses the same symbol in these three manifestations of the same context of impending death. Nor is an Egyptian allusion demanded, as Griffiths asserts, by the adjacent lines. The snakes as a symbol of death are most apposite in the context of an Egyptian queen who has relied upon the aid of animal deities against the gods of Rome. This is the ironical point Virgil is making. And, in so far as the allusion is to the defeat of Cleopatra, the demand for an Egyptian allusion is satisfied!

The passages from Horace (*Odes* 1, 37, 26–8) and Propertius (3, 11, 53–4) can be taken together. Propertius certainly is referring to the depiction of Cleopatra's suicide carried in Augustus' triumph; Griffith notes this interpretation by Butler and Barber with apparent approval. But even if two snakes were shown in the representation, this would not prove that two were actually used. Griffiths will not allow that poets exaggerate for effect, but he can hardly deny that military conquerors frequently do! In fact, it is not legitimate for Griffiths to adduce Plutarch, *Antony* 86, for the artistic representation, as he does (p. 116). I say this because in his account Plutarch uses the singular 'asp' in his Greek for the depiction. Griffiths, who ridicules the explanation of the Horatian passage as 'plural for singular' as being a mere 'grammatical refuge', can hardly use this Plutarch singular to account for poetic plurals!

The other question I wish to ask in this communication is this: did Cleopatra really die by the bite of an asp, or asps? Griffiths mentions Plutarch (*Ant.* 86) and Dio Cassius (51, 14) as sources for

the one-asp theory. But both these authors cast doubt on the very tradition. Plutarch says that those who believed in the asp theory claimed that the snake was smuggled in to her in a bowl of figs. Yet nobody could find the asp in the room afterwards! Cleopatra's corpse only showed two small punctures. A rival theory was that she took poison from a hollow comb which she wore. So Plutarch. Dio is even more sceptical. He says that no one really knew the cause of death. Upholders of the asp theory make no mention of a bowl of figs, but believed in a water jar or a bowl of flowers as having secreted the reptile. The other view was that Cleopatra used a poisoned hairpin. Earlier (51, 11) Dio notes that Cleopatra had been known to keep asps 'and other reptiles (ἑρπετά)' with a view to using them for suicide, but he will go no further than this. What he does say is that, upon the demise of Cleopatra, a eunuch killed himself by the bite of snakes; but he uses the word ἑρπετοῖς, not 'asp'.

Augustus certainly believed in the asp theory. Dio says that he tried to revive her by the use of *Psylli*, tribal medicine men famed for their ability to suck out poison from snake bites, but in vain. This story is also given by Suetonius (*Aug.* 17). I have no desire to prove that Cleopatra could not have perished by the bite of one or more snakes, and I accept many of Griffiths' religious reasons as plausible. But his classical testimonia for his two-snake theory do not prove anything. Moreover, in writing such an article, he should surely have noted alternative theories about Cleopatra's death which are just as ancient and just as well-founded as the asp tradition.

LXXIX

COLUMELLA'S SOURCES AND HOW HE USED THEM

In his concise but significant account of the life and writings of Columella, published 12 years ago and possibly the last thing written on this author in English, E. S. Forster (one of the Loeb editors) commented on the strange neglect of Columella and his treatise *De Re Rustica* (1). We can sympathise with this lament and try to improve on this state of affairs. The neglect is a fairly modern phenomenon ; he is widely quoted in later antiquity (and, of course, by his contemporary Pliny) by such writers as Pelagonius, Eumelus, Vegetius, Palladius, Cassiodorus and Isidore. The first printed edition came out at Venice in 1472 and the first Aldine edition in 1514. It is no secret that Milton, in his tract *On Education* advised students to read him along with Cato and Varro. However, since the 18th century, Milton's countrymen have shown little enthusiasm for this precept. We now have the advantage of an accessible text in the shape of the Loeb edition, and also the article by Forster mentioned above (2). But the great work on Columella goes to the credit of Lundstrom and the Swedish scholars.

My own purpose in this paper is to describe the many sources drawn on by Columella and show how he used them, how critical he was prepared to be, and how technically useful his work is. Forster can be quoted here : « Columella was no mere theorist and the *De Re Rustica* is essentially a text-book. In preparation for his work he made a deep study of writers on agriculture from Hesiod to his own day, and gives us a list of some fifty authors, most of whom are mere names to us. One of those whom he quotes most often is the Carthaginian writer Mago, whose book the Roman Senate caused to be translated into Latin. The idea of copyright being unknown to the ancients, we find Columella borrowing anything which he fancies from the writings of his predecessors Cato and Varro».

I agree with all this save the last sentence which I consider to be very unfortunately and misleadingly expressed. It gives the impression that Columella was a scissors and paste compiler with more diligence than acumen. This is not the case. He quotes many authorities many times, but this is surely necessary for any writer on such a technical subject, and I hope to show that he was prepared to distribute praise or blame according to his

(1) *Columella and his Latin Treatise on Agriculture* in *Greece and Rome*, XIX, Oct. 1950, pp. 123-128.

(2) Loeb Edition : Volume I edited by H. B. Ash, 1940 ; Volume II by E. S. Forster and E. H. Heffner, 1944 ; Volume III by Forster and Heffner, 1955. In all my references and footnotes I use the Loeb pagination in respect of chapters and paragraphs

taste. In the early sections of Book One (I, I, 7ff.) he gives a long list of his authorities, both Greek and Latin. This can be regarded as both a list of sources and as a prescribed reading list ; today it would appear at the end of a book as a Bibliography. Pliny adopted the same scholarly procedure (1) and used his first book to list his manifold sources for his entire work.

I concentrate on the Roman or Latin sources listed by Columella. Quite naturally Cato heads the list ; he is praised as the man *qui eam* (sc. *agricolationem*) *latine loqui primus instituit*, a verdict with which few would disagree. Next the two Sasernas, father and son, are mentioned as having refined Cato's treatment (*eam diligentius eruditerunt*) ; we know little of these two, but they are also commended by Pliny (2). Tremelius Scrofa is lauded for his vivid style (*qui etiam eloquentem reddidit*), and inevitably Varro is brought forward for the same reason (*qui expolivit*). Vergil is given a single acknowledgement at this point, obviously for the *Georgics* (*qui carminum quoque potentem fecit*). Columella's next source is perhaps more surprising. He adduces Julius Hyginus with the accolade « the paedagogus as it were of the science ». Hyginus is known to us as a writer on Astronomy, a subject so disliked by Columella that he composed an apparently polemical treatise *Adversus Astrologos* which is lost (3). Then Mago is mentioned as *rusticationis parentem* and the official translation of his 28 *memorabilia volumina* into Latin by order of the Senate is noted. This incident throws a welcome light on the more familiar *Carthago delenda* policy towards Carthage and Africa. Pliny also mentions it and adds a few more details to Columella's bald reference (4).

After the above Columella appends the names of his contemporary sources (*non minorem tamen laudem meruerunt nostrorum temporum viri*). These number three : Cornelius Celsus, the medical writer, is said to have embraced *totum*

(1) Pliny, *N.H.*, 18.5.

(2) The classic attempt to reconstruct these lost writings is that by R. Reitzenstein, *De Scriptorum Rei Rusticae Libris Deperditis*, Berlin Dissertation, 1884.

(3) Columella, XI.I.31 : Commenting on Vergil, *Georgic I*, 204ff.

Tam sunt Arcturi sidera nobis
Haedorumque dies servandi et lucidus anguis,
quam quibus in patriam ventosa per aequora vectis
Pontus et ostriferi fauces tentantur Abydi.

He writes : *Contra quam observationem multis argumentationibus disseruisse me non infitior in iis libris, quos adversus astrologos composueram.* He goes on to say that in that work he strongly attacked the Chaldaean astronomers. This does not mean, of course, that Columella would satisfy modern exigencies in distinguishing between Astronomy and Astrology ; much of his Book XI is taken up with a Vergilian discussion of the calendar seasons and the agricultural work which is to be done at the appropriate times. But it does underline the point that Columella is at pains to use his authorities as selectively as he knows how.

(4) Pliny, *N.H.*, 18.5 : *Poenus etiam Mago, cui quidem tantum honorem senatus noster habuit Carthagine capta ut, cum regulis Africae bibliothecas donaret, unius eius duodetriginta volumina censeret in Latinam linguam transferenda, cum iam M. Cato praecepta condidisset, peritusque Punicae dandum negotium, in quo praecessit omnes vir clarissimae familiae D. Silanus.*

corpus disciplinae in 5 books, and coupled with him is Julius Atticus who is credited with *de una specie culturae pertinentis ad vitis singularem librum.* The third man is one Julius Graecinus, described as *velut discipulus* of Atticus and as author of two volumes on viticulture *composita facetius et eruditius.* Later on Columella describes Atticus and Celsus as *aetatis nostrae celeberrimi auctores* (III. XVII. 4).

All the above are constantly referred to by Columella in the course of his work. Close examination shows that he is very discriminating in his use of authorities and is not willing to accept a statement on trust merely because it is made by a famous name. In the case of Cato I have adduced 17 refe-ences (1). Every one concerns a technical point. Apart from a single comment on him as *prisci moris exemplum* (XI. I. 5), Columella is free from the vice of unreasoning adulation of « Old Cato the Censor ». In nearly every case Columella cites Cato without comment in such a way as to imply agreement, but he does once reject Cato's views on the pruning of year-old cuttings (IV.XI.I).

The Sasernae are frequently cited (2). One of them, presumably the father, is hailed as *non spernendus auctor rei rusticae* (I.I.4). They are said to share Cato's misconceptions on pruning, and also are criticised for their advice on the siting of vineyards (3.XII.5). The most interesting reference is to their practical experiments in setting vine shoots, which are said to have refuted some ancient misconceptions (III.XVII.4). It is notable that Columella does not cite them after his first four books and uses them above all for viticulture.

The same conclusion applies to Tremelius Scrofa, except that he is mentioned once in Book Five. Publius Silvinus, the man to whom Columella dedicates his work, is said to prefer Tremelius above all others (II.I.2) ; Columella praises his style as *eleganter et scite* but says he is too reliant on ancient sources. This implies that Columella thought him to be too theo-

(1) The references are : I.II.2 (reproof of masters less skilled than their own vilices) ; I.III.I (on how to select farm land for working) ; I.III.5 (his precepts on the need to choose good neighbours upheld) ; I.III.7 and I.IV.I (on selection of farm land) ; I.IV.8 (on perfect size of a farm) ; I.VIII.7 (on the need for vilex to stay at home in masters' interests) ; II.II.6 (on the merits of well-watered meadow land) ; II.XVI.2 (as above, on meadow land) ; II.XXI.5 (on the validity of using mules for work on holidays) ; III.II.31 (on the need to test and approve vines before using them) ; III.III.2 and III. IX.3 (on high yields from certain vineyards) ; IV.XI.I (his precepts on pruning year-old cuttings are rejected) ; VI. Pref. 4 (views on the profitability of grazing cattle) ; XI.I.5 (on need for trained vilex) ; XII.LII.19 (his advice on olives refutes earlier misconceptions).

(2) The references are : I.VII.4 (evils of absentee landlords in agriculture) ; II.XII.7 (on how to use labour to best advantage) ; II.XIII.I (on the fertilising uses of certain crops) ; III.III.2 (they disagree with Tremelius on vine supports) ; III.XII.5 (they prefer vineyards to face East ; Columella qualifies this and other theories) ; III.XVII.4 (their practical experiments on setting vine shoots praised) ; IV.XI.I (they share Cato's error on the pruning of year-old cuttings).

retical, and elsewhere he is several times criticised for misconceptions (I.I.6 ; II.I.5 ; II.X.8 ; V.VI.2). On the other hand Columella once says that he tried and approved Tremelius' advice (II.VIII.5).

Nine references to Varro seem uniformly favourable (1) ; he is once described as *eximius auctor* and is cited on a wide range of topics (city luxury and neglect of agriculture ; vineyard yields ; land surveying ; mules in Africa ; ponds).

Hyginus is mainly used by Columella as an authority on apiculture. He is praised for collecting ancient sources « industrie » (IX.II.Iff.) but there is an implied attack on him for including « fabulous » materials on the origin of the science after the manner of the Fourth Georgic. In another context Columella claims to have failed repeatedly in following Hyginus' precepts on turnip cultivation (XI.III.62).

Mago naturally appears frequently in Columella's pages (2). A translation of him by a certain Dionysius of Utica is mentioned. Apart from an occasional hint at only qualified approval, Columella is very favourable and obviously uses Mago as a prime source. The same is true of Pliny.

Columella has many kind things to say about his celebrated contemporary Cornelius Celsus. We have already seen that he coupled Julius Atticus and Celsus together as the most celebrated authors of his age ; later on (IV.VIII.I) he repeats this tribute in more or less the same terms : *Celsus et Atticus, quos iure maxime nostra aetas probavit.* The breadth of Celsus' erudition is hailed in glowing colours (*non solum agricolationis sed universae naturae prudentem virum*), though, significantly, this prefaces a biting criticism by Columella of his false opinions on the nature of black soils (II.II.15). Of the many citations from Celsus for technical points (3), it is notable that three times Columella

(1) These are : I.Pref.15 (deplores urban luxury and neglect of agriculture) ; III. XXXII.2 (on high vineyard yields in Faventia and Ager Gallicus) ; III.IX.3 (on vineyard yields and merits of Aminean wines) ; V.I.5 (units of land measurement) ; VI.Pref.7 (on surpassing merits of oxen in Italy) ; VI.XXXVII.3 (on mules in Africa) ; VIII.VIII. 9 (on profits to be derived from pigeons) ; VIII.X.6 (prices of thrushes) ; VIII.XVI.5 (luxury of fishponds).

(2) See J. P. Mahaffy, *The Work of Mago on Agriculture* in *Hermathena*, 7, pp. 29-35. References are : I.I.10 (the translation into Latin) ; I.I.18 (on evils of absentee landlords) ; III.XII.5 (vineyards should face North) ; III.XV.4 (his precepts for protecting vine roots from the elements approved) ; IV.X.I (his advice on Spring pruning approved) ; V.V.4 (precepts for vine planting received with caution) ; VI.I.2 (advice on how to buy good oxen) ; VI.XXXVII.3 (on African mules) ; IX.XIV.6 (on bees being generated from stomachs of slain bullocks) ; IX.XV.3 (on the folly of exterminating drones in swarm of bees) ; XII.IV.2 (his taboo on sexually impure people handling preserving vessels approved) ; XII.XXXIX.I (recipe for raisin wine) ; XII.XLVI.6 (on use of sawdust in fruit preserving vessels).

(3) Those not included in the text of this article include : I.VIII.4 (on the requisite qualities of the vilex) ; II.IX.II (on seed selection) ; III.II.24, 25, 27, 31 (various precepts on types of vine) ; IV.X.I (on pruning methods) ; IV.XXVIII.2 (on reasons for

shows warm approval of Celsus' dicta (*ait prudentissime*, VII.II.2 ; *ait verissime*, VII.III.II ; *existimat verissime*, VIII.XIII.2 , but twice explicitly rejects Celsus' precepts on the harvesting of grass and the yoking of oxen (II.II.24 ; II.XI.5). It is perfectly clear that Columella does not allow his obvious admiration for Celsus to blind him to any errors of technical detail that the latter might make.

Equally objective is his treatment of Julius Atticus. Despite the laudatory coupling with Celsus, Columella five times rejects his recommendations on vine planting and cognate subjects, once dismissing his scheme as *vitiosa* (III.III.12 ; III.XVI.3 ; III.XVIII.2 ; IV.I.6 ; IV.II.I). Also Atticus' scheme for pruning is dismissed as self-contradictory (IV.XXIX.I). On the other hand, Columella approves his precepts for making vine props and planting chestnuts (IV.XXX.I ; IV.XXXIII.4).

Julius Graecinus is used by Columella exclusively as an authority on viticulture ; in one case he quotes an anecdote directly from the *De Vineis* of Graecinus (IV.III.6). Apart from once claiming to have changed from approval to disapproval of his method of evaluating land suitable for viticulture (III.II.31), Columella is generally favourable or at worst non-committal on his merits (1).

Vergil is a special case. I do not propose to discuss the literary merits of Columella's Tenth Book in which Horticulture is discussed in Hexameter verse, but it is too facile just to dismiss it as a « poor mans Georgic » ; we may take his claims to have been forced into poetic effusions by the pleas of Silvinus with a smile of tolerant scepticism, but he is quite entitled to claim to be following up the hope of Vergil that others after him would deal with the theme of Horticulture left by himself. Columella has nearly thirty references to Vergil outside the Tenth Book ; they are nearly all direct quotations or obvious and acknowledged paraphrases from the Georgics. He does, however, dismiss the fable of bees being spontaneously generated from the carcases of slain bullocks. In the main, I would say that Columella fully recognises how careful one has to be in using didactic poetry as a source for a technical treatise.

All the writers discussed so far are those brought forward by Columella as his main sources and as books his own readers ought to use. Though many of them are but names to us, they were all clearly well-known in Columella's day, and he was only doing the conventional thing in adducing them. It is the careful and objective way in which he handles them and his readiness

the growth of vines) ; VI.V.5, VI.XII.5, VI.XIV.6 (on remedies for plague amongst oxen) ; VII.V.15 (on sheep illness) ; VIII.XIII.2 (on Geese) ; IX.II.2 (praise of his work on Apiculture) ; IX.VI.2, IX.XI.5, IX.XIV.6, IX.XIV.18 (various precepts on apiculture).

(1) References are : III.II.31 (on evaluating barren land as prospective vineyard) ; III.III.4, 7, II (disrepute, prices and profits of viticulture) ; IV.III.I (a bon mot on zealous beginnings to enterprise which fade away) ; IV.III.6 (an anecdote on vineyards and dowries) ; IV.XXVIII.2 (on how to dig in vineyards).

to criticise even the most celebrated of his predecessors and contemporaries which deserves our admiration and a revival of interest in Columella himself.

Certain other sources are mentioned by Columella which are worthy of a little discussion. A certain Caesonius is cited once on the need to make preliminary visits to land marked out for purchase (I.IV.I), but he is otherwise unknown. So too are Marcus Ambivius and Licinius Maenas who are cited as authorities for the arts of Baker and Cook (XII.IV.2) ; along with these two latter appears the more well-known Gaius Matius, credited with a treatise on the art of the Cellarman. This may be the Matius after whom a certain apple was named. The recipe book of Apicius gives instructions for making a dish called *Minutal Matianum* (1). In his final book, Columella mentions Matius as the author of three books entitled *Cocus*, *Cetarius*, *Salgamarius*, but implies that these are strictly for the gastronome of means (2).

Personal, non-written sources applied to by Columella are mentioned on occasion. Chief of these was his uncle Marcus Columella, whom he always mentions with the greatest respect, and whom he credits with experiments in viticulture, sheep-breeding, the uses of manure, and the preservation of grapes and wine (3). Seneca is mentioned once (III.III.3) as *vir excellentis ingenii atque doctrinae*, and as the owner of vineyards in Nomentum. Columella also says he listened to Publius Volusius (*veterem consularem*) descanting on the virtues of native tenants (I.VII.3), and that Marcus Trebellius (*noster*) asked him for advice on methods of land measurement (V.I.2).

Finally a word on Publius Silvinus, the man to whom Columella dedicates his work. He is unknown outside of this source, but is quite obviously a countryman and friend (4). He is said to have had an estate at Caere (III. IX.6) and to have experimented in viticulture. Naturally Columella always addresses him with courtesy ; however one reference is interesting. Silvinus

(1) APICIUS, 174, p. 112, in the edition of Barbara Flower and Elisabeth Rosenbaum (London, 1958).

(2) XII.XLVI.I : *Nec ignoro plurima in hunc librum non esse collata, quae C. Matius diligentissime persecutus est. Illi enim propositum fuit urbanas mensas et lauta convivia instruere. Libros tres edidit, quos inscripsit nominibus Coci, et Cetarii, et Salmagarii.*

(3) References are : II.XV.4 (*M. Columellam, patruum meum, doctissimum et diligentissimum agricolam*, credited with experiments in manure) ; V.V.15 (*vir illustribus disciplinis eruditus, ac diligentissimus agricola Beaticae provinciae* ; skill in viticulture) ; VII.II.4 (*acris vir ingenii, atque illustris agricola* ; experiments in sheep breeding) ; XII.XXI.4 (*illustris agricola* ; techniques of wine preservation) ; XII.XL.2 (on making « afterwine ») ; XII.XLIII.5 (grape preservation).

(4) It would be worthless to list the references to 19 passages in which he is mentioned simply by name in the vocative case without more ado. The pertinent passages are : II.I.I (he is said to revere old agricultural writings, especially those of Tremelius) ; III.IX.6 (described or flattered(?) as expert on viticulture and the Ceretanum estate mentioned) ; IV.I.I. (the reading by Silvinus of Columella's books to students) ; V.I.4 (he asks for instructions on « Mensura »).

is said (IV.1.1) to have read Columella's books on viticulture to several students who voiced certain criticisms on methods on vine planting. Were Columella and Silvinus running a sort of Agricultural College on their estates? This is only a bold conjecture, but it is certain that Columella felt deeply about the problems of Agriculture, and may have been moved to take practical steps to rectify the situation, if only to ensure properly trained bailiffs on his own estates.

To conclude. It is unfair to judge Columella purely as a writer of practical value for Agriculture; Italian Agriculture of the First Century A.D. must not be judged from the standpoint of our own Country and Century. I have endeavoured to show that from the point of view of his Age Columella emerges as a diligent and critical writer, eager to use the best theoretical sources, but equally concerned to show by practical experiment the best methods available. He does not shrink from rebuking a Cato or a Celsus if he thinks it necessary in the interests of scientific truth. He uses Greek manuals extensively but sensibly, which is no small virtue. Without attempting any evaluation of his literary style, either prose or verse, I would say that Forster's plea for a renaissance in Columellan studies ought not to go unheeded.

LXXX

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *ARATUS* ASCRIBED TO GERMANICUS

D. B. Gain, the most recent editor of this poem, leaves the question of authorship open [1]. That is fair enough. Honest incertitude is always a virtue in the absence of conclusive evidence. His restriction of candidates to Germanicus or the emperor Tiberius, however, begs some questions and overlooks others. Indeed, Gain's discussion of this issue is the most meagre and ill-informed part of an otherwise exemplary edition. A fresh and full look at the problem is imperative. Hence the present paper.

The manuscripts are not helpful. In some the poem is anonymous; others offer *Claudii Caesaris Arati Phaenomena* for a title; in still others the piece is credited to T. Claudius Caesar [2]. Such discrepancy is striking, perhaps suggestive of ancient ignorance or confusion in the matter. The absence of the name Germanicus will escape no one.

External evidence imports further complication. Jerome [3] confirms that Germanicus Caesar translated Aratus into Latin. That is also the name referred to as author of our poem by Lactantius in his two citations from it [4]. However, a different picture seems to emerge from Firmicus Maternus [5]. For he asserts that *nec aliquis paene Latinorum de hac arte institutionis libros scripsit nisi paucos versus Julius Caesar et ipsos tamen de alieno opere mutuatos, Marcus vero Tullius, princeps ac decus Romanae eloquentiae ... versibus heroicis*

[1] D. B. Gain, *The Aratus ascribed to Germanicus Caesar*, London 1976, 16-20. This work is hereinafter referred to by its author's name.

[2] For the details, cf. Gain.

[3] *Comm. in Ep. Tit.* 706b; Germanicus is coupled with Cicero and Avienius.

[4] *Inst.* 1, 21, 28; 5, 5, 4. Lactantius' citations (in each case alluding to Germanicus' work as *Arataeum carmen*) are respectively lines 112 and 165-168.

[5] *Math.* 2 *praef.* 2.

etiam ipse de institutione pauca respondit. Elsewhere [6], Firmicus epitomises this information and phraseology, observing *Latine vero Caesar et decus eloquentiae Tullius...*

Gain seeks to harmonise the testimony of the manuscripts with that of the above trinity of authors by postulating an original title along the lines of *x Claudii x, postea Germanici Julii Caesaris Aratus: Phaenomena*. Which procrustean exercise gives Tiberius and Germanicus their chance. The former, before imperial adoption, was called Tiberius Claudius Nero; at his accession, he is transmuted into Tiberius Julius Caesar Augustus. The full name of Germanicus is not on record, but he will (of course) have had the *nomen gentilicium* of Claudius. His adoptive nomenclature became Germanicus Julius Caesar.

Thus runs the argument. It is consonant with the basic facts of prosopography, and in itself is by no means implausible. Nevertheless, there are difficulties unacknowledged by its proponent. For one thing, there is no guarantee that Firmicus Maternus is actually talking about Germanicus. True, he is in the right company with Cicero as a translator of Aratus. Yet it is a little odd that he should precede the orator in both passages, if Germanicus is meant.

More to the point is Julius Caesar himself. A brief notice in the *Suda* (K 1196 Adler) credits the dictator with a work on Latin grammar and a translation of the *Phaenomena* of Aratus. The fact that the first item is authentic [7] does not ensure the second, but it may be encouraging. Nor can the statement be dismissed as a Byzantine fantasy, at least not without debate. For the elder Pliny attests that Caesar produced a work *de astris* [8]. Similar references are provided in late antiquity by Macrobius [9], John Lydus [10], and the scholia to Lucan [11].

[6] 8, 5 (not adduced by Gain).

[7] The *De Analogia* is clearly meant.

[8] In the *Index Auctorum* to *Nat. Hist.* 18: *ex L. Tarutio qui graece de astris scripsit, Caesare dictatore qui item.*

[9] *Sat.* 1, 16, 39: *Julius Caesar siderum motus, de quibus non indoctos libros reliquit.*

[10] Who cites Caesar on the subjects of January and bird migration in October (*De Mens.* 4, 18; 4, 128).

[11] With reference to Lucan 10, 185: *quia suus* (sc. *Caesaris*) *liber quem composuit de computatione non inferior libro Eudoxi sit*; and to 10, 187: *est autem liber fastorum divi Julii Caesaris qui ordinationem continet...*

It is not clear whether all of these allude to the same piece. Nor is it anywhere specified that Caesar composed his work in Greek or Latin, prose or verse. But Caesar the poet is abundantly attested [12]. And his work on the calendar implies both interest and expertise in astronomy.

The argument here is not that Julius Caesar wrote the extant poem ascribed to Germanicus. It is rather that he could have produced an *Aratus* of his own, as the *Suda* maintains. And if so, that this might be the work alluded to by Firmicus Maternus. Thus Gain's effort at reconciling those testimonies adduced by himself (he ignores Julius Caesar and the dictator's astronomical work) may not be the right approach.

Suetonius, to be sure, nowhere mentions an *Aratus* or anything resembling one in his account of Caesar's literary activities (*Caes.* 56). Yet, on Gain's own reckoning of possible candidates, this would disqualify no theory: the biographer does not attribute any such work either to Germanicus or Tiberius.

Even if Julius Caesar be left out of the game, problems persist. Simple reference to Tiberius or Germanicus as Julius Caesar is, to say the least, peculiar. Why not do the straightforward thing and call the emperor by his natural name? As did, for instance, the younger Pliny [13]: in a register of imperial poets, he is plain Tiberius Caesar. As for Germanicus, the epigraphic evidence discloses that he was almost invariably styled Germanicus Caesar, without the Julius [14]. Nor was it customary to denote Tiberius by the title of Germanicus; according to Dio Cassius, that was only done "sometimes" [15].

As a method of precise identification, the unadorned name of Germanicus was intolerably vague. Too many men bore the cogno-

[12] Suetonius, *Caes.* 56, mentions a *Laudes Herculis*, a tragedy on the theme of Oedipus, and a poem entitled *Iter*. For more generalising tributes, cf. Tacitus, *Dial.* 21, 6; Pliny, *Ep.* 5, 3, 5; Plutarch, *Caes.* 2, 4.

[13] *Ep.* 5, 3, 5 (in the context of erotic poetry).

[14] For the evidence, cf. *PIR*² J 221, where there is a comment to the effect that *inde* (i. e. after his adoption) *dictus Germanicus Julius Caesar, Gentilicium in titulis Latinis rarissime datur ... nonnumquam in Graecis*. Tiberius likewise tended to eschew the gentile name Julius (cf. Furneaux' edition of the *Annals*, vol. 1, 148).

[15] 57, 8, 2, stating that the emperor was generally styled as plain Caesar. Observe that the names of both Julius and Germanicus are absent from his mortuary inscription (cf. Furneaux, *loc. cit.*).

men [16]. After its posthumous conferment upon Drusus and his family, it became part of the style of all the Julio-Claudian rulers. Which is of some moment in the matter of Gain's attempted reconciliation of his testimonies. For in terms of their full nomenclature, both Claudius and Nero could be possible candidates! Given his notorious artistic predilections, the latter might even entice.

Such notions are by no means frivolous. They serve to point up the insecurity of any precise identification. In the next generations, *Germanicus* was part of the titulature of princes as disparate as Vitellius, Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan. Of this quartet, one may beckon.

Namely Domitian. It was long ago suggested [17] that he was the author of the extant *Aratus*. Unhappily, in that it brought the notion into ill repute, on very poor grounds. In line 2 of the poem, the unnamed addressee is apostrophised as *genitor*. It was maintained that this had to be taken literally, therefore disqualifying both Tiberius and Germanicus, neither of whom could possibly be addressing a flesh and blood imperial father. In point of fact, any dictionary will disclose non-literal uses of the noun.

Yet a theory need not fail because of one bad argument. Domitian merits a closer look. He is undeniably the one emperor likely to have paraded the title of Germanicus on his own writings. Contemporaries are markedly fond of addressing him thus. Frontinus, for instance, employs the title in four of five named references [18]; it is also ubiquitous in the *Silvae* of Statius [19]. The obsessive pride of the emperor in his title is ultimately evidenced by his fancy for renaming the month of September with it [20].

Domitianic interest in poetry is attested both by his flatterers and his detractors [21]. The allegation of the latter that his enthusiasm

[16] Cf. Mommsen, 'Die Familie des Germanicus', *Hermes* 13, 1878, 262; Furneaux, vol. 1, 148-9; R. Syme, *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958, 13, 222.

[17] By Rutgers, *Var. Lect.* 2, 122 (inaccessible to me, and known through the discussion and criticism of Teuffel-Schwabe 275, 5).

[18] *Strat.* 1, 1, 18; 2, 3, 23; 3, 11, 7; 4, 3, 14.

[19] *Silv.* 1, 1, 5; 4 *ep.*; 4, 1, 2; 4, 2, 25; etc.

[20] Suetonius, *Dom.* 13, 3.

[21] Quintilian 10, 1, 91; Martial 5, 5, 7-8; Statius, *Silv.* 3, 619; *Achill.* 1, 14-15; Valerius Flaccus 1, 12-14; Suetonius, *Dom.* 2, 2, 20; Tacitus, *Hist.* 4, 86, 2.

was a youthful counterfeit that did not long survive into his own reign does not have to be taken too seriously. Moreover, he was credulous towards astrologers, a trait that may be partly and pertinently connected with his addiction to the writings of Tiberius. Finally, some sort of scientific curiosity is evidenced by an early production of his on the subject of metallurgy [22].

The idea that Domitian was the author of the *Aratus* is altogether ignored by Gain. It tends to be scoffed at on two counts: the inanity of the argument concerning *genitor*, and the absence of any reference to such a composition by his adulants [23]. Enough has been said on the first point. The second can be mitigated simply by remarking the absence of any such attribution to Tiberius or Germanicus in the sources. The silence of Suetonius in this regard was earlier observed. It is even more pronounced in the case of Ovid's flatteries of Germanicus (of which more anon) in the *Fasti*, *Tristia*, and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. More than once he adverts to the literary talents of that prince [24]. There was occasion enough for a mention. And a requisite impetus: Ovid himself was the author of a *Phaenomena*.

The name of Domitian obviously cannot be reconciled with the Claudius or T. Claudius Caesar of the manuscripts of the *Aratus*. Unless, that is, the latter in any way originated with a false inference from the name Germanicus. Domitian remains pertinent, however, in the light of the aforementioned testimony of Lactantius and Jerome [25]. Given the versions by Cicero and Avienius, and what we have seen to be attributable to Julius Caesar, it is a reasonable possibility that there were quite a number of Latin translations of Aratus (and/or poems entitled *Phaenomena*) circulating. A situation ripe for confusion and false ascription on the part of late antiquity and mediaeval scribes.

[22] Adduced by the elder Pliny in his bibliography for *Nat. Hist.* 33.

[23] This point was refutation enough for (e. g.) Teuffel-Schwabe, *loc. cit.*

[24] See especially *Fasti* 1, 23-26; *Ex Pont.* 4, 8, 65-70.

[25] One last thought may be ventured in a footnote. In line 186 of the *Aratus*, the author inserts the phrase *prodest maiestas saepe parentis*, in the context of Jupiter as founder of the divine race. A Roman notion, as Gain observes, appropriate to Germanicus or Tiberius. And at least equally so to Domitian, it might be thought, as the son and brother of *divi*. For the Roman elements in the poem, cf. P. Steinmetz, 'Germanicus, der römische Arat', *Hermes* 94, 1966, 450-482.

Gain eschews all such possibilities, confining his attention to Tiberius and Germanicus. The arguments are (quite properly) divided into two categories: external evidence and inferences from the poem itself. Germanicus does not prosper much in the first area. The only item laid under contribution is the Suetonian eulogy (*Cal.* 3, 1-2) of the prince's literary talents. The biographer credits him with bilingual excellence in *eloquentia* and *doctrina*, adding that he left some Greek comedies *inter cetera studiorum monimenta.*

This is congruent with what is said about his oratorical skills in Tacitus (*Ann.* 2, 83, 4), and with the flatteries in Ovid. And one might subjoin the occasional poems ascribed to him in late collections [26]. Nowhere is there any hint of a version of Aratus. Not that the silence of Tacitus means anything. The historian notoriously does not go in for literary bibliography. And the reticence of Ovid might simply be explained by supposing that Germanicus had not yet embarked on an *Aratus* at the time the poet addressed him. What is striking is the failure of Suetonius to mention any such work. Either there was none, or he did not think fit to commemorate it, which would be an interesting reflection of his literary taste or his biographical methods.

The point recurs in the case of Tiberius, to whose claims Gain devotes far more space. Again, and perforce, the argument is based on what Suetonius has to say. The first item to be exploited is the biographer's claim that Tiberius was addicted to astrology and mythology. That may well be true, but it need not imply the production of an *Aratus*. Cicero composed one, after all, and he could hardly be called an addict. And it is overall fairer to see the poem under discussion as astronomical rather than astrological: there is a difference.

Like Germanicus, the emperor is credited with bilingual competence. What better evidence, asks Gain, than writing a Latin poem based on a Greek? It is unclear why he did not ask the same question of Germanicus. The bibliography furnished by Suetonius (*Tib.* 70, 1) is restricted to a *Conquestio de morte L. Caesaris*, and some Greek

[26] *Anth. Lat.* 708 (= *Anth. Pal.* 9, 387, ascribed by some by Hadrian), 709 (cf. *Anth. Pal.* 7, 542); *Anth. Pal.* 9, 17, 18 (cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 8, 155). These trifles are of no use in determining Germanicus' claims to the *Aratus*. Just for the record, the first of them, on the subject of Hector's tomb, might be correlated with the Suetonius statement (*Cal.* 3, 2) that *sicubi clarorum virorum sepulchra cognosceret, inferias manibus dabat.*

verses after the manner of his favourite poets, Euphorion, Rhianus, and Parthenius. Gain is surely scraping the barrel when he makes a point of the fact that the first two of these were Alexandrian poets like Aratus. No more persuasive is the assertion that his long Rhodian exile will have given Tiberius ample leisure to study astronomy, a science developed by the Rhodians Attalus, Hipparchus, and Geminus. One did not need a long sojourn on that Greek island to produce a Latin version of Aratus. And, although it proves nothing, one should at least notice that the only intellectual pastime ascribed to Tiberius during this period by Suetonius was constant attention at the exhibitions of rival sophists (*Tib.* 11, 3) [27].

Gain lays much emphasis on fragment six of the present poem: *quidni te divite lingua,/Graecia, praecurram potiusque triangula dicam?* He sees therein a concordance with the Tiberian aversion from excessive intermingling of Greek with Latin [28]. That argument is vulnerable on several fronts. First, his text reproduces an emendation by Housman [29], who replaced the *cur* of the manuscripts by *quidni te*, alleging that the text as it stood was "unconstruable". In point of fact, it does not seem impossible to retain the reading *cur* and understand the passage as a justification for Greek terminologies.

Second, even if Housman's alteration be accepted, it need have no bearing on the case for Tiberian authorship. Romans before him had condemned indiscriminate admixture of Greek and Latin. Horace, *Serm.* 1, 10, 20f. is most to the point. The author of the *Aratus* could well have been indulging in a regular motif.

Or in a variant on the standard device of giving and spelling out the Greek and Latin names for the same constellation and so on. Cicero does this quite often in his version, including (it should be noted) once in the context of the Triangle [30].

Finally, the business of Tiberian avoidance of Greek is misplaced and exaggerated. Suetonius explicitly states that the emperor disap-

[27] Cicero likewise studied oratory and philosophy on Rhodes, according to Plutarch, *Cic.* 4, 5; there is no suggestion that his version of Aratus was stimulated by time spent on the island.

[28] Gain is unfairly criticised for ignoring this item in the review of his edition by W. W. Briggs, *Class. Journ.* 73, 1978, 369.

[29] *Class. Rev.* 14, 1900, 39 (= *Class. Papers* 2, 215).

[30] *Aratea*, frs. 5, 14, 28, 33. 5, 222, 317-318; cf. the Budé edition of J. Soubiran, Paris 1972, 88, 197-198.

proved of Graecisms in senatorial debates and decrees, and in the courts. Otherwise, he was *sermone Graeco promptus et facilis*, and there is no suggestion that he extended this ban into literary composition.

Lines 558-560 of the poem refer to the death and apotheosis of Augustus. This yields only a terminus *ante quem non* for the piece. It does not imply that the event was a recent one. Any poet at any time could have shoved in the allusion to adorn a description of Capricorn.

Which leaves us with the prefatory lines 1-16. An unnamed (is this significant?) *genitor* is invoked as the bringer of peace, and is besought thus: *adsis nato numenque secundes*. It is assumed by Gain (and others) that this must allude to an emperor. That is probable, although not a certainty. The language of flattery could bestow such compliments on non-imperial personages. *Numen*, to take the cardinal point, was always of wide application. Livy, for instance, could compose a speech containing a collective exhortation to the senate to offer *nutum numenque vestrum* [31].

The point has further application to the matter at hand. Gain feels that the apostrophe is most appropriate to Tiberius saluting the deified Augustus. Tiberius, his argument runs, did not really restore peace on the Augustan scale; and anyway, he tended to avoid honours and would not have welcomed being addressed as a god.

Gain overlooks the simple fact that panegyric can ignore the truth. And flatterers may offer more than the recipient would wish. Suetonius (*Tib.* 27) consecrates an entire section to anecdotes illustrating the very point of Tiberius shrinking from and rebuking excessive compliments. When Ovid rhapsodised over the triumph of Germanicus and Tiberius in the year 17, he does fail to claim the restoration of *pax* thanks to *Caesareo numine* [32]; and elsewhere [33] he applies *numen* to Tiberius.

According to Gain, if Tiberius is the author, lines 1-16 must refer to Augustus; if Germanicus wrote them, Tiberius must be

[31] Livy 7, 30; cf. Quintilian 6, *praef.* 10: *iuro per illos manes, numina mei doloris.*

[32] *Fasti* 1, 282-285.

[33] *Ex Pont.* 2, 8, 37-38. For an example of Greek flatteries of the pre-imperial Tiberius, cf. Crinagoras, *Anth. Pal.* 16, 61.

addressed. He does not indicate why it would have been impossible for Germanicus to address a poem to Augustus, living or dead. Another piece of unwarranted dogmatism obtrudes in the statement that the author's description of his poem as *doctique laboris/primitias* (lines 3-4) must mean that it is his first work. Why may it not just as well mean that it is the author's first effort on an astronomical theme? [34].

This latter item is not trivial. Gain employs it in the construction of his theory that Tiberius may have written the *Aratus* many years before A. D. 14. Lines 558-560 will have been inserted, and lines 1-16 brought in to replace an original preface closer to the Aratean one, after the death of Augustus, thus making a sort of second edition.

The notion is not impossible. Ovid's procedure with the *Fasti*, wherein Germanicus can be seen gradually but not consistently replacing Augustus, is the most piquantly pertinent analogy. Why Germanicus cannot be visualised as easily as Tiberius in this activity is something else that Gain does not go into.

Nevertheless, there is a fundamental weakness in the theory. The poem opens thus: *Ab Iove principium magno deduxit Aratus./ Carminis at nobis, genitor, tu maximus auctor...* The first three words were, of course, a standard opening formula [35], and one that came to be associated with Aratus [36]. However, the vital point is that this exordial reference to Zeus/Jupiter, postulated at once by the statement that someone else is even more worthy of the address, is equally commonplace. An early example is Theocritus 17, where the poet begins with Zeus but devotes the aftermath to eulogy of Ptolemy. Ovid has a sequence *ab Iove ... nunc opus est ...* (*Met.* 10, 148f.). Most striking is Calpurnius Siculus who, with Virgil in mind, begins a stanza with *ab Iove principium*, only to break off and address Nero in the line *at mihi, qui nostras praesenti numine terras/perpetuamque regit iuvenili robore pacem* (4, 82-85). The presence of *numen* and *pax* in these lines catches the eye with some force.

Thus, the opening of the *Aratus* in no wise connotes a second edition, but only indulgence in literary commonplace. As an argument for authorship, it is as flimsy as the rest of Gain's suggestions. In

[34] For *primitiae* in the sense of literary first-fruits, cf. Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att. praef.* 3.

[35] See Gow's note on Theocritus 17, 1 for the phrase in Greek literature.

[36] Quintilian 10, 1, 46; Strato, *Anth. Pal.* 12, 1.

our present state of ignorance, guessing games are the only resort. If we *must* restrict the choice to Tiberius or Germanicus, the latter is more likely, simply on the grounds of nomenclature: the Germanicus Caesar of Jerome and Lactantius will be recalled.

A widow's mite can be tossed in. It is known from Tacitus (*Ann.* 2, 23-24) that the fleet of Germanicus was involved in a disastrous storm in the year 16. It was an episode that prompted some vigorous verses from one of Germanicus' officers, Albinovanus Pedo [37]. Now descriptions of the perils of the deep are a recurrent feature of Aratus' poem. And at least one of these sequences is treated in a free and expanded way by the author of our Latin version [38]. It is just conceivable that Germanicus was prompted by a personal experience to explore and describe the *phaenomena* as a consequence. Only a guess, put forward with due trepidation. However, a date of composition in the last couple of years or so of Germanicus' life would have the advantage of consonance with Ovid's otherwise strange failure to mention the poem in his own eulogies of Germanicus Caesar.

[37] Quoted by the elder Seneca, *Suas.* 1, 15.
[38] Lines 288-305 (with Gain's notes); cf. also 103f; 171-173; 343f; 392f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LXXXI

THE SECOND CENTURY FROM SECULAR SOURCES

All sensible bibliographies are selective. Even so, the above termini may seem a trifle capricious. In fact, they chose themselves, serving as they do to highlight two superb works of scholarship which complement each other in a way that encapsulates the most important secular features of this period: G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969); E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (Harvard, 1980).

In addition to what follows, readers should assume the constant relevance of what has become the biggest academic bonanza of our time, namely the multi-volumed *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* (henceforth *ANRW*), edited from Tübingen by H. Temporini and W. Haase (published by De Gruyter, Berlin, 1972—). Formally intended as a *Festschrift* for Joseph Vogt, this has now become an infinitely expanding affair, disconcerting in that few people (not least the honorand) may live to see the end of it, and absurd in that much of the content, conceived (as the subtitle claims) *im Spiegel der neueren Forschung,* is doomed to built-in obsolescence or hasty rewriting at proof stage. Nevertheless, there is much of value in each of the twenty-six volumes (4 on the Republic, 22 on the Principate) that have appeared at the time of writing (March, 1981).

That suffering and often insufferable hypochondriac, the pagan sophist Aelius Aristides, and the Christian father from Africa, Tertullian, did not have much in common. But they render virtually identical verdicts on the second century. In the *Roman Oration* (best read in the edition, with translation and commentary, of J. H. Oliver, *The Ruling Power, Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 43.4, Philadelphia, 1953), Aristides assured his audience (101) that "You have measured and recorded the land of the entire civilized world . . . you have accustomed all areas to a settled and orderly way of life." Tertullian (*On*

the Soul 30) found this same age to be "a world every day better known, better cultivated, and more civilized than before."

Such compliments provide the basis of Edward Gibbon's celebrated judgment:

> If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus. The vast extent of the Roman empire was governed by absolute power, under the guidance of virtue and wisdom. The armies were restrained by the firm but gentle hand of four successive emperors whose characters and authority commanded involuntary respect.

The Gibbonian view, though still influential in textbooks, is nowadays under challenge. Solomon Katz, *The Decline of Rome* (Cornell, 1955) 19, is typical: "The tranquility of the Antonine Age was deceptive' peace existed but precariusly, prosperity was neither widespread nor deeply rooted. The seeds of decay were germinating beneath the surface and soon sprouted under the favoring circumstances of foreign war and internal chaos." This view, which has the effect of converting the Antonine period into something resembling the Edwardian sunset of early twentieth-century Britain, is most snappily conveyed by D. R. Dudley, *The Civilization of Rome* (New York, 1962) 177: "The world was to pay a heavy price for the happy days of Antoninus spent over the grape harvests at Signia."

A literary survey such as this is not the place to fight out questions of historical interpretation. But it is impossible to write or read a book or article on a writer of the second century without bearing these issues in mind. And Gibbon can here be brought back, in the darker mood of a related verdict on the age:

> If we except the inimitable Lucian, this age of idolence passed away without having produced a single writer of original genius or who excelled in the arts of elegant composition . . . The name of Poet was almost forgotten; that of Orator was usurped by the sophists. A cloud of critics, of compilers, of commentators, darkened the face of learning, and the decline of genius was soon followed by the corruption of taste.

The questions here begged by Gibbon are patent. Which makes it sad and significant how many scholars have parroted him. Aulus Gellius provides a pertinent case. For many years, the classic modern account of him was that of H. Nettleship, "The *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius," *American Journal of Philology* 4 (1883) 391-415. Nettleship poured scorn on the alleged intellectual futility manifest in the anecdotes of the *Noctes Atticae*. He did not or would not see that his own scholarship might be vulnerable to the same charge. The circles of Gellius devote themselves to minute studies of language, textual criticism, and style. What was wrong with that? Certainly, any

contributor to this journal would not be out of place in a Gellian *soirée*.

Although the pendulum is perhaps starting to swing the other way, sweeping condemnations of the culture of the age still prevail in the textbooks. I am one of a generation of classicists nurtured on Duff's *Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age* (London, 1927). Such metallurgical approaches to *Kulturgeschichte* are themselves all too classical. When Dio Cassius reached the reign of Commodus in his *History,* he lamented (71.36.4) that "Our history now descends from a kingdom of gold to one of iron and rust, as affairs did for the Romans of that day." This attempt to keep literature on some sort of classical gold standard has little to do with reality. Sadly, it persists. In many respects, no one will ever write a better account of imperial Roman Literature than Gordon Williams, *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley, 1978). But the equation of change with decline tells its own tale, and it is not surprising that the one unsatisfactory part of this book is that which glances with quick contempt at the second century.

A seemingly fatuous question needs to be asked: just what do we mean by the second century? Gibbon's praises were applied to the period 96-180, his strictures to the reigns of Hadrian and the Antonines. Similarly, modern talk about cultural deserts and so on belong to the latter epoch. Of necessity; few Latinists would want to include (for easy instance) Juvenal and Tacitus in this intellectual limbo. But they, and others, straddle more than a chronological divide; hence, they play a part in the present survey.

Notwithstanding this, it is the period after Trajan's death in 117 that causes the greatest problems and so demands the most attention. The average textbook of Roman history will usually go down to 337. With varying degrees of enthusiasm, of course. Still all too typical is the experience of C. T. H. R. Ehrhardt, whose suitably wry account (*Classical World* 63.7 [March, 1970] 222) deserves to be quoted (it is equally significant that a classical journal in the last decade thought it deserved to be published):

> As a lecturer, I had always managed to keep off unknown ground, either staying safely among the Greeks or, at furthest, expatiating on the constitutional arrangements of Augustus. Now, however, I was cornered: I had to give a course on Roman imperial history to the death of Marcus Aurelius, and my ignorance was to be exposed.

The snag is, apart from the blinkered nature of many school and university curricula, our lack of a full historical source. With the aid of what remains from the Greek and Latin literature, along with the

standard ancillaries of the historian—coins, inscriptions, legal texts, papyri, and the whole panoply of archaeology—good books have been written. Recent and full, with copious bibliographies of its own, is A. Garzetti, *From Tiberius to the Antonines* (English version by J. R. Foster, London, 1974). Still fundamental is the somewhat older work of M. Hammond, *The Antonine Monarchy* (Rome, 1959). All aspects are or will be covered by *ANRW*; so far, its volumes are particularly rich in provincial history. Expert and up to date surveys of the available epigraphical and papyrological materials are A. K. Bowman, "Papyri and Roman History: 1960-75," *Journal of Roman Studies* 66 (1976) 153-73; J. Reynolds, "Roman Inscriptions: 1971-5," ibid., 174-99 (especially 195-6 for epigraphy and Christianity). No single scholar can ever be entirely abreast of everything; regular checks of *L'Année Epigraphique* and such journals as the *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* and *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* help keep one above water. Of particular interest to readers of this journal will be the projected *Corpus Papyrorum Christianarum,* recently announced by E. A. Judge and S. R. Pickering of Macquarie University, North Ryde, Australia.

Though flatly written, Fergus Millar's *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London, 1977) makes deft and exhaustive use of all the above types of material to produce a work of brobdingnagian size (657 pages) and enduring importance (cf. the detailed critique by K. Hopkins, *Journal of Roman Studies* 68 (1978) 178-86). At first blush, it is something of a paradox that this scholar of all people should write under such a title. For Millar is amongst those who disbelieve in the modern writing of imperial biographies, once (in his review of F. Grosso, *La lotta politica al tempo di Commodo,* in *Journal of Roman Studies* 56 (1966) 243-5) asserting that "neither the actions of an Emperor nor the politics of a particular reign can be meaningfully studied until the whole social context of the imperial power has been examined over a substantial period, and perhaps not even then."

A tall order. Meanwhile, the debate continues—as does the production of imperial biographies. Millar's own book is not cast in the biographical form, albeit his guiding principle "the emperor was what the emperor did" betrays the ultimate impossibility of separating human beings from their own actions. A very different approach from Millar's is that of my own *The Roman Emperors* (Montreal, 1980), a work intended for non-specialist students and that perhaps mythic beast the general reader, written in the belief that the individual is of paramount importance in history and on the principle that Lord Acton on power does not always apply. Readers of this

journal will derive particular pleasure and value from the biographical studies of A. R. Birley, whose *Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1966) and *Septimius Severus* (London, 1971) provide between them an almost complete account of the personalities, history, and literature of the second century.

Birley is in a good position to appreciate the perils of biography, having also translated for the Penguin Classics series much of the *Historia Augusta* under the title of *Lives of the Later Caesars* (1976). Since one of the quirks of the ancient biographical tradition is that the first two of Gibbon's good emperors are squeezed out between where Suetonius ends and the *HA* begins, Birley here provides an incidental service by fashioning biographies for Nerva and Trajan out of the available sources. Another detractor of biography is the paladin of modern historians of Rome, Sir Ronald Syme, pronouncing it to be "cheap and easy," and "the easy approach to history" (*Tacitus* [Oxford, 1958] 91, 503). One supposes that his subsequent investigations into the *HA* have done nothing to change Syme's mind. For this vexed compilation of imperial biographies, covering (with a gap in the third century) the period 117-284, is one of the chief reasons it is impossible to write a full, formal history of the second century. Every attempt to do so has, perforce, had to reckon with this most exasperating and mysterious of ancient sources. In the past, varying degrees of credulity have been displayed. Nowadays, few serious scholars would take it at face value, with the partial exception of Arnaldo Momigliano. Syme, in two books, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968) and *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), with a concomitant stream of articles, has revived to most people's satisfaction the 1889 theory of Dessau that the *HA* is the work of a single impostor of the late fourth century. One can quibble over the details (cf. the valuable review of Syme's first book by Alan Cameron, himself one of the leading scholars of the subject, in *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 [1971] 255-67). I, for instance, see nothing like the need for such phantom sources as *Ignotus* the Good Biographer and Enmann's *KG* as that insisted upon by Syme and disciples. The *HA* has spawned an enormous bibliography, beyond the mastery of any one scholar. Consultation of the volumes appearing with some regularity in the *Bonner-Historia-Augusta-Colloquia* series helps to keep one *au courant*. A third monograph by Syme, *The Historia Augusta: a Call of Clarity* (Bonn, 1971), exhaustively and sometimes exhaustingly goes over his differences with Momigliano. One other book on the subject deserves special mention and praise: T. D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (no. 155 in the Collection

Latomus series, Brussels, 1978). Readers, however, having sampled some of the literature, may well end up agreeing with Fergus Millar (*A Study of Cassius Dio,* 124) that "the problem of the *HA* is one into which sane men refrain from entering."

Collapse of the *HA's* credibility leaves students of the second century in something of a bind, since so much that was written in earlier and more innocent times depended upon it. The major source for our period ought to have been the *History* of the consular Dio Cassius, writing in Greek in the early third century. And, had the relevant sections survived, we would have been in good hands for the most part. Alas, only scraps of his account of Hadrian survive, whilst that of Antoninus Pius was lost even to his Byzantine epitomators. The only English version is the not always reliable one of E. Cary in the Loeb Classical Library series, and the scholarly field in English remains largely the property of F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964). F. Kolb, *Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian, und der Historia Augusta* (Bonn, 1972) is valuable, but highly technical and not for the novice. Help, however, is with any luck on the way, in the shape of a multi-volumed commentary on Dio's imperial books by a stable of scholars. Teamwork is always difficult to harness, and money remains a problem. For information on this project, readers should contact Dr. John Humphrey, Department of Classics, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4, Canada.

The one remaining historical source for the later second century is Herodian, whose Greek narrative encompasses the years 180-238. His merits have been very variously estimated, from the eulogy of the Byzantine critic Photius (*Bibliotheca,* cod. 99) to the contempt of some (not all) moderns (Syme, *Emperors and Biography,* 184, dismisses him as "a rhetorician, fluent, dishonest, and inventive"). One brief study worth consulting is G. W. Bowersock, "Herodian and Elagabalus," *Yale Classical Studies* 24 (1975) 229-36. But everything one could possibly want to know about Herodian can be found in the introduction, commentary, and bibliography of C. R. Whittaker's two admirable Loeb volumes (Harvard, 1969).

There is nothing comparable on the Latin side. We have probably lost something of value in the biographies of second century emperors by Marius Maximus, a distinguished coeval of Dio Cassius. This character is inextricably entangled with the *HA,* thus being omnipresent in the literature thereon. Marius (along with Juvenal—a nice collocation) had a vogue in the fourth century, according to the disgusted comment of Ammianus Marcellinus 28.4.14, but this did not

save his work from extinction. Ammianus himself began his narratives in 96, where Tacitus left off, a choice of terminus that may imply that he had no predecessor in this field. The whole question of later Latin historiography is well treated in T. D. Barnes, "The Lost *Kaisergeschichte* and the Latin Historical Tradition," *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1968/9* (Bonn, 1970? 13-29.

It does not appear as though the second century produced a Livy or a Tacitus. What about a Virgil or a Horace? Thanks to its fragmented condition, it is easy to forget that a good deal was actually written in the era of Hadrian and the Antonines. The full story is still best read in the second volume of H. Bardon, *La Littérature latine inconnue* (Paris, 1956). We know what we have lost. The question is, how much of that loss is to be lamented. It is often assumed that we have been deprived only of second or third-raters. That may be the case. But it should never be forgotten that this is a Queen of Hearts verdict, reached without evidence. Looking back over earlier Roman literature, we know that one great classic has been lost in Lucilius. Most of the writers singled out for admiration by Horace (at the end of *Satires* 1.10), Ovid (*Tristia* 4.10.41f.), and Quintilian (in his tenth book) are only names to us. The loss of most early Roman poetry and drama, despite the interest of Hadrian, Gellius, and the late grammarians, bears further witness to the unreliability of survival statistics.

These matters are touched on in Williams' *Change and Decline.* A useful earlier study is that of B. A. Van Groningen, "General Literary Tendencies in the Second Century A.D.," *Mnemosyne* 18 (1965) 41-56. More determined attempts to reconstruct some of the literary rubble are those of Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome;* Alan Cameron, "Poetae Novelli," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 84 (1980) 125-73; and my own "Literature and Society in the Later Roman Empire," forthcoming in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome,* edited by B. K. Gold (Austin, 1981). Finally, an article more significant than its brevity might suggest is L. Holford-Stevens, "Elocutio Novella," *Classical Quarterly* 26 (1976) 140-1.

Graecia victa ferum victorem cepit, said Horace, and the Greek fact (as a modern journalist would put it) is central to any appreciation of the second century. Greek influences were felt at all levels, a situation helped by the presence of at least two philhellene emperors, Hadrian the *graeculus* and Marcus Aurelius the so-called Stoic prince. Greeks and other easterners increasingly were found in high places, a process documented by W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (Munich, 1970), and G. Alföldi, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen* (Bonn, 1977). Of particular interest (and envy) to the

modern scholar is the way in which intellectuals came to Rome from the old world of the Greek East, either as individuals or on official embassies, and gained prestige and influence at the court and elsewhere. On any reckoning, the most symbolic year is 143, in which Herodes Atticus and Cornelius Fronto were consuls, the Greek holding regular office whilst the Roman had but a suffect consulate. By far the best account of all this is G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969). In part a sequel to his earlier *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), this book achieves an admirable synthesis of the literary (mainly the *Lives of the Sophists* by Philostratus) and the epigraphic evidence. No work of scholarship is immune to criticism. As the reviewers have chorused, Bowersock's treatment of individuals who do not fit into his picture, especially Lucian, can be bizarre; and, to my taste, he underplays the role of poets and poetry. But the book is already a classic, and has produced a school of followers. These fruits are best sampled in *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (University Park, Pennsylvania, 1974), a collection of papers given at a panel of the American Philological Association.

As Juvenal and Tacitus make ferociously clear, the Greek was not always a welcome sight in Rome. Two books that contain much pertinent material on this large topic are N. Petrolichos, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks* (Athens, 1974), and A. Wardman, *Rome's Debt to Greece* (London, 1976). It is important to acknowledge that, whatever liberals might say, not all anti-Greek sentiment was crude racialism. Too many Greek intellectuals strutted around Rome with their noses in the air, in the manner of Kingsley Amis' *One Fat Englishman* in America. Philostratus has several anecdotes about such characters. And, although not quite so unwilling to recognize the existence of Latin literature as most scholars have supposed (Aulus Gellius and Athenaeus both exhibit Greeks discussing Roman topics), they all too often tended to look to the past by choice and the present by compulsion. All of this is delineated in the illuminating paper of E. L. Bowie, "Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic," *Past & Present* 46 (1970) 1-41.

As on the Latin side, much of the Greek literature from the second century is lost. The best general study of what it was, or might have been, like is certainly B. P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles apres J. C.* (Paris, 1971). Those who do not have French in their repertoire will still do best with the chapter on the Second Sophistic in A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* (English translation, London 1966) 829-45. Some documents that illustrate these literary substrata can be read in the excellent collection

of N. Lewis, *The Roman Principate: 27 B.C. — A.D. 285* (Toronto, 1974). For good reason, contemporary interest in this area tends to focus on the Greek novel. Here again, Reardon leads the way, with two useful papers: "The Second Sophistic and the Novel," in the aforementioned *Approaches to the Second Sophistic;* "Aspects of the Greek Novel," *Greece & Rome* 23 (1976) 118-31. The same scholar has also promised a bibliographical survey of the subject for a future volume of *ANRW*. One practitioner of the genre currently exciting much interest is Lollianus, arguably that Lollianus who features in the Philostratean gallery of Antonine sophists. The fragments of his *Phoinikika* were published by A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos* (Bonn, 1972). Notable papers thus engendered include: L. Koenen, "Notes on Papyri," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 16 (1979) 109-16; G. N. Sandy, "Notes on Lollianus' Phoenicica," *American Journal of Philology* 100 (1979) 367-78; C. P. Jones, "Apuleius' Metamorphoses and Lollianus' Phoinikika," *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 243-54; J. Winkler, "Lollianus and the Desperadoes," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980) 155-81. For the non-specialist, however, the best introduction to Lollianus and his brethren may well be *Erotica Antiqua,* edited by B. Reardon (Bangor, 1977), a collection of papers delivered at the International Conference on the Ancient Novel at Bangor in 1976.

"Of the making of books there is no end," remarked the preacher. And if one could have comparatives of truthfulness, this dictum would apply even more so to the production of articles. In the following survey of major non-Christian authors in the second century, books will predominate. Not that they are on principle to be assumed more valuable. Callimachus, who as both poet and librarian should have known, once observed that a big book is a big evil; these wise words offset the sanguine belief of the elder Pliny that no book is so bad as to be wholly useless. For good practical reasons, an essay of the present sort should probably give books the preference. Some articles are included where appropriate, and the reader is routinely directed to all available bibliographical surveys, wherein hundreds of articles are tabulated and summarised. Also, *L'Année Philologique* furnishes references for all authors and subjects down to 1978.

Aelius Aristides is better known to us than most Antonine sophists in that he is one of the few of that breed of whose oratorical exhibitions some specimens survive. If typical, as they almost certainly are, they do not engender a desire for more. The vanities and obsessions of Aristides lend substance to the anecdotes of Philostratus and the satires of Lucian. His hypochondria makes him an easy target for

modern mockery. Yet we should not be too unfeeling. "There was much sadness in his life," is the conclusion of his most sympathetic modern student, C. A. Behr, whose *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Chicago, 1968) constitutes the one major study in English. The same scholar is engaged on a selection of his speeches for the Loeb series, of which two volumes have appeared.

The historians Appian and Arrian wrote mainly about earlier events and personalities, though the latter's *Discourses* of Epictetus will interest many readers of this journal. But they themselves belong to the second century, and thus to the present survey. Both feature in Bowersock's *Greek Sophists* and the aforementioned article of E. L. Bowie. A paper on Appian by the latter is promised for a future volume (in press, at the time of writing) of *Yale Classical Studies* consecrated to later Greek literature. Arrian has received a monograph in the shape of P. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill, 1980). P. A. Brunt's revised version of the Loeb edition of the *History of Alexander* and *Indica* (volume 1, with long introduction and some bibliography, came out in 1976) is a great boon. But the doyen of Arrian scholars is A. B. Bosworth, the first volume of whose long-awaited commentary on the History of Alexander is now in print (Oxford, 1981). Bosworth has led up to this with many important papers, of which "Arrian's Literary Development," *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1972) 163-85, is most pertinent to this survey.

Apuleius stands out, not merely in the second century but in Roman literature as a whole. Most people read only his novel *Metamorphoses* (better known nowadays as the *Golden Ass*). This is a pity; the *Florida* are not without interest, and his *Apology,* a document showing the narrow line between reason and unreason that existed in his world, deserves to be read by all students of antiquity. In the last decade, the Apuleius industry has swung into full gear, notably at Groningen where the Apuleian Centre has emerged as the world headquarters. From here comes *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass,* edited by B. Hijmans Jr. and R. van der Paardt (1978), a collection of papers by various scholars, exhibiting healthy disagreement and fortified by copious bibliography. These articles are perforce highly technical; the novice or person wanting only a general account could not do better than begin with the chapter on Apuleius in P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970), then go on to J. Tatum, *Apuleius and the Golden Ass* (Cornell, 1979). Of the detailed commentaries on individual books or parts thereof that have been coming out, chiefly from Groningen, that on the first by A. Scobie (Meisenheim am Glan, 1975) is the most generally useful. Nevertheless, most readers of this journal will probably find J. G. Griffiths' *The Isis Book*

(Leiden, 1975), a commentary on book eleven with translation, of greatest interest. For other scholarship, see the bibliography for Apuleius by C. C. Schlam, *Classical World* 64 (1971) 285-309, and that for ancient prose fiction drawn up by G. N. Sandy, ibid. 67 (1974) 321-59. Another survey is promised by L. Callebat, a notable Apuleian, for *ANRW*.

In the words of Bowersock (*Greek Sophists,* 73), "Men of considerable intelligence in the second century attached great value to dreams . . . and through an appropriate accident the one great dream book which has survived from antiquity is Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica,* which seems to belong to the Antonine period." Dreams and their interpretation should be a topic of interest to readers of this survey, who will surely disagree with the old view of R. Geer (*Classical Journal* 22 [1927] 663) that "the works of Artemidorus on dreams enjoys a well-deserved neglect." Samplings from the *Oneirocritica* are conveniently provided in N. Lewis, *The Interpretation of Dreams and Portents* (Toronto, 1976). And readers should not miss the delicious assemblage of athletes' dreams and their meaning appended to H. A. Harris, *Sport in Greece and Rome* (London, 1972).

Athenaeus, when he is thought of at all, is thought of as a prolix antiquarian whose sole value is as the preserver of fragments of Greek poetry. There is much more to him than that. He belongs to the Antonine or Severan sophistic movement and controversies, and the teeming pages of his *Deipnosophistae* are an important document for the personalities and issues of the age. Not least of the author's virtues is his occasional attitude of tart irreverence towards the ill-controlled erudition of his interlocutors. Apart from the relevant sections of Bowersock's *Greek Sophists,* I must, *faute de mieux,* refer readers to my two studies, "Athenaeus and his Work," *Acta Classica* 19 (1976) 21-42, and "The Minor Characters in Athenaeus," ibid. 20 (1977) 37-48.

The appearance of Calpurnius Siculus in these pages will come as a surprise, since he traditionally belongs to the age of Nero. This minor Latin poet owes his mention to the recent attempt at relocating him in the Severan period by E. Champlin, "Life and Times of Calpurnius Siculus," *Journal of Roman Studies* 68 (1978) 95-110. Would that Champlin were right, since it would ease the drought of extant Roman poets in the third century and spread out the links connecting Virgil and Nemesianus in the pastoral tradition. So far, Champlin has had little luck, to judge from the first two vigorous rebuttals to appear: G. B. Townend, "Calpurnius Sinculus and the *Munus Neronis,*" *Journal of Roman Studies* 70 (1980) 166-74; R. Mayer, "Calpurnius

Siculus: Technique and Date," ibid. 175-6.

Few would read Dio Chrysostom for his style, or indeed for much of his vapid content. But there is enough solid matter to make him a useful witness to society in the late first and early second centuries. After the notice of him by Philostratus, a good place to begin is the paper by J.L. Moles, "The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 98 (1978) 79-100. By a quirk of fate, 1978 was *the* year of Dio, in that it saw the epiphany of two major studies: P. Desideri, *Dione di Prusa: un intellettuale greco nell' impero romano* (Florence, 1978); C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Harvard, 1978). Of the two, it may be observed that Jones, in his effectively laconic way, says as much if not more in 208 pages as does Desideri in 641. Both provide further bibliographical guidance; and there is to be a further survey by B. F. Harris in *ANRW*.

Like Appian and Arrian, Florus was an historian of earlier times. But it is interesting to see how his nation's past appeared to a Roman of the second century. And Florus is important as a pioneer of that drab genre, the epitome. It is tempting, too, to make him interesting by identification with the homonymous poet with whom the emperor Hadrian exchanged badinage. Quite the best study is the first chapter of W. Den Boer, *Some Minor Roman Historians* (Leiden, 1972).

It was once said of Fronto that he lost his reputation by being discovered. Certainly, the remains of his letters and other writings belie the great esteem he enjoyed in late antiquity. But even if the style is the man, it is not always everything. By any reckoning, Fronto was a key figure of the Antonine age. His correspondence is a vital witness to the cultural and emotional atmosphere of the times. There is much of value on Fronto in Bowersock's *Greek Sophists*. He also features prominently in my own study of Aulus Gellius (see below). But Fronto deserved a good book of his own, and he now has it in the shape of E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (Harvard, 1980). For once a publisher's blurb can safely be quoted: "By close analysis of many of the letters and by the deployment of formidable prosopographical skills, Mr. Champlin has coaxed information out of this rich material, and he weaves it into a clear social history." Earlier work on Fronto was surveyed by R. Marache, *Lustrum* 10 (1965) 213-45; a new bibliography by R. Wauter is scheduled from ANRW.

A recurrent theme in the exchange of letters between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius is their mutual ill health, a valetudinarianism attested by such external sources as Galen, Gellius, and Lucian. The case of Aelius Aristides has already been remarked. Hypochondria, in

Bowersock's words, was possibly the most disquieting aspect of Antonine society. This goes a long way towards explaining the rise of the iatrosophists, a breed that persists into late Roman and Byzantine times, and the prestige of a Galen. The son of an architect from Pergamum, Galen lived throughout the Antonine era (129-199). Apart from his medical skills, he wrote extensively on literary and philological matters, playing a full role in the intellectual debates of his time. Thus, it is proper (albeit he says little) that he should be one of Athenaeus' deipnosophists. Some years ago, I speculated that Galen might have been a friend of Lucian, an ally in their "fight" for moderation in Atticism against the extreme pedantry of scholars such as Phrynichus. The notion did not sit well with all reviewers. However, G. Strohmaier, "Ubersehenes zu Biographie Lukians," *Philologus* 120 (1976) 115-22 (cf. the follow-up M. D. Macleod, "Lucian's Activities as a *Misalazon,*" ibid. 123 [1979] 326-8), has recently disclosed a previously unknown reference by name to Lucian in an Arabic text of Galen. Congenial to myself for obvious reasons, this is a good example of crosscultural research, and a welcome reminder of the interdependence of scholars across he disciplines. There has been good earlier work on Galen, notably G. Sarton, *Galen of Pergamum* (Kansas, 1954), and R. Waltzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians* (Oxfords, 1949). But various prolegomena, especially "The Chronology of Galen's Early Career," *Classical Quarterly* 23 (1973) 158-71, lead one to believe that this will be equaled if not eclipsed by V. Nutton, *Galen: Problems and Prospects* (fortcoming, Cambridge, 1981).

Aulus Gellius was a sort of Roman Boswell, serving many Johnsons, including such diverse luminaries as Favorinus, Fronto, and Herodes Atticus (see Bowersock's *Greek Sophists* and my own *Studies in Lucian* for the first and last of these). His *Noctes Atticae* have been described as a kind of "*Reader's Digest* of Antiquity," an acceptable judgment if intended as a compliment (I have more than a sneaking feeling that it was not). This survey has earlier defended the scholarship of Gellius against the strictures of Gibbon and Nettleship. Those who wish only for a general guided tour through his work cannot do better than S. Whiteley, "Fossicking through Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae,*" *Acta Classica* 21 (1978) 99-114. More detailed are my own "Aulus Gellius and his Circle," *Acta Classica* 16 (1973) 103-7, and *Studies in Aulus Gellius* (Lawrence, 1975). Less sympathetic, but of great value both general and particular, is J. E. G. Zetzel, "*Emendavi ad Tironem:* Some Notes on Scholarship in the Second Century A.D.," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77 (1973) 227-43. See also the many papers (too numerous to be listed here) by the Italian scholar

Giorgio Perini. Earlier work is reported in the survey of Fronto by Marache, mentioned above.

As a poet active in at least the early years of Hadrian, Juvenal warrants a mention here. It is a sobering thought for those who think that the major classical authors have been "done" that he has waited until now for the first complete commentary on him in English. This, by E. Courtney, is now out (London, 1981). On the grand scale (over 600 pages), it will, thanks to its own merits and the economics of publishing, probably be the last as well as the first. Also on the grand scale is J. Gérard, *Juvenal et la réalité contemporaine* (Paris, 1976). Another mammoth volume, it will not cause many students to throw away their copies of G. Highet's *Juvenal the Satirist* (repr. Oxford, 1962), still the best despite its biographical fantasies and extreme judgments. Basic information about Juvenal can be had from any book on Roman satire. By far the best in a crowded field is M. Coffey, *Roman Satire* (London, 1976), a miracle of compressed learning and sanity. In addition to the various surveys of Roman satire by W. S. Anderson in *Classical World* 50 (1956) 33-40; ibid. 57 (1964) 293-96, 298-301, 343-8; ibid. 63 (1970) 181-94, 199, 217-22, Juvenal has his own bibliographers in M. Coffey, *Lustrum* 8 (1964) 161-215; R. Cuccioli Melloni, *Bolletino di Studi Latini* 7 (1977) 61-87.

Lactantius is obviously not a figure of the second century. He is brought in to allow mention of R. M. Ogilvie, *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford, 1978), an austerely illuminating guide to which works of pagan literature the Christian fathers were reading (and thereby preserving) and which they were not, a matter whose ramifications go far beyond one author and one century.

To some Byzantines, Lucian was the Antichrist, a persistent label which helped get him put on the first edition of the Catholic Index of Forbidden Books and which caused him to be the target as late as 1766 of a Jesuit drama, produced at Regensburg, entitled *Lucianus Samosatenus infelix atheus.* For other *Nachleben,* cf. C. Robinson, *Lucian and his Influence in Europe* (London, 1979). Macauley was no doubt prompted by much the same reasons to dub the satirist the "Voltaire of Antiquity." For good or ill, Lucian deserves none of this. Excluding the spurious *Philopatris,* he has little to say about Christians; and what there is (in the *Peregrinus* and *Alexander,* the two pieces likely to be of most interest to readers of this journal) is as favorable as not. This whole question is thrashed out, with copious bibliography, by H. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament* (Berlin, 1961). These days, the main question is whether Lucian's writing was the product of his reading or his personal

experiences. My own *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto, 1973) attempts to place him somewhere between these two extremes, which are largely the work of J. Bompaire, *Lucien ecrivain* (Paris, 1958) and A. Peretti, *Luciano: un intellettuale greco contro Roma* (Florence, 1946). If nudged, I would go more to the second pole than the first, albeit acknowledging that an earlier study of mine, "Lucian as Social Satirist," *Classical Quarterly* 11 (1961) 199-208, went too far. One who firmly heads in the other direction is G. Anderson, whose monographs *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic* and *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* (both published at Leiden, 1956), along with numerous articles, abound with valuable literary parallels, if too dismissive of the historical background. Two brief reviews of recent work have been provided by Bompaire in *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 87 (1974) 474-6; ibid. 88 (1975) 224-9. A full survey of Lucianic scholarship is promised by M. D. Macleod for *ANRW*.

Marcus Aurelius is one of the few Roman emperors who can speak to us in his own words. In this case, the *Meditations* or *Golden Book* as well as his correspondence with Fronto. In addition to the two imperial biographies by A. R. Birley, earlier discussed, Champlin's book on Fronto, and the relevant pages of Bowersock's *Greek Sophists,* the most useful new study (a little rambling, on occasion) is P.A. Brunt, "Marcus Aurelius in his *Meditations,*" *Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974) 1-20.

The younger Pliny is a privileged witness to the regime of Trajan and will be of interest to all readers of this journal for his famous exchange of letters with the emperor on what to do with the Christians in his province of Bithynia. Imperfections of detail apart, the commentary on his letters by A. N. Sherwin-White (Oxford, 1966) is unlikely to be equalled, let alone bettered. Bibliographical surveys are provided by J. Beaujeu, *Lustrum* 6 (1962) 272-303, and P. V. Cova, *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 4 (1974) 274-91; P. Fedeli is planning a fresh one for *ANRW*.

Few classical authors have enjoyed the enduring interest of Plutarch. The stream of books shows no sign of abating; it is significant that *ANRW* plans not one but two surveys (by P. A. Stadter and B. Scardigli) of the literature. Those who seek only a reliable general survey can start and finish with D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London, 1973). There is also A. Wardman, *Plutarch's Lives* (London, 1974), in the same vein but narrower in scope. Devotees of *Nachleben* should go to M. W. Howing, *The Influence of Plutarch* (Chapel Hill, 1970). An example of the technical literature is B. Bucher-Isler, *Norm und Individualität in den Biographien Plutarchs* (Bern/Stuttgart, 1972).

Plutarch naturally features in most treatments of ancient biography; cf. A. Momigliano, *Development of Greek Biography* (Harvard, 1971), if only for its vast bibliography. Books likely to be of particular interest to my present readers include: H. Betz (ed.), *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden, 1975); *id., Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden, 1978); F. E. Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's Moralia and Lives* (Leiden, 1977); T. Vernière, *Symboles et mythes dans la pensée de Plutarch* (Paris, 1977). But if I could only choose one book on Plutarch, it would be C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), a worthy product of the Bowersockian method. Anyone still hankering for more should consult B. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs, Ein Forschungsbericht* (Munich, 1979), or (for older work) R. Flacelière's survey in *Association Budé. Actes du VIIIe Congrès, Paris 1968* (Paris, 1969) 483-505.

Suetonius lived until at least the early years of Hadrian. He is another of those included here for the sake of his influence and for the second century view of earlier Roman imperial history. One recent study is E. Cizek, *Structure et idéologie dans Les Vies des Douze Césars de Suétone* (Bucarest/Paris, 1977). My own *Suetonius* is scheduled to appear later this year (Amsterdam, 1981). The most recent item of value is R. Syme, "Biographers of the Caesars," *Museum Helveticum* 37 (1980) 104-28. S. Döpp is preparing a survey of the literature for *ANRW*.

Similar reasons prompt the inclusion of Tacitus. The many works of Syme will always dominate the study of this historian, above all his *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958). A judicious essay on all aspects of Tacitus, with detailed bibliographical annotation, is that of F. D. R. Goodyear, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1970, in the *Greece & Rome* New Surveys in the Classics series, no. 4). The same scholar has brought out the first part of his new edition of the *Annals* (Cambridge, 1972): though full of sound philology, it is an odd endeavor for one who professes himself "no historian." The year 1979 saw the appearance of the first full-scale commentary in English on the *Histories* (at least, on the first two books) by G. E. Chilver (Oxford). There are massive bibliographies for all aspects of Tacitus by R. Hanslik, *Lustrum* 16 (1974) 143-304; ibid. 17 (1976) 71-216; H. W. Benario, *Classical World* 63 (1970) 253-67; ibid. 71 (1977) 1-32. And *ANRW* will have several more, by such distinguished scholars as R. M. Ogilvie, D. Timpe, and K. Wellesley.

Finally, Tertullian, as a Christian writer not strictly eligible for this survey is, nevertheless, the ideal conclusion, in the shape of

T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian* (Oxford, 1971). This exemplary (apart from the author's unwarranted discourtesy towards scholars who hold different views) study demonstrates how secular history, pagan culture, and the Christian revolution can be drawn together in a single life. Barnes has done for a Christian writer what Bowersock and others have acheived for their pagan counterparts. This ambition, admirably realized, can and should serve as a model and encouragement for others.

LXXXII

LATE ANTIQUITY: A REVIEW ARTICLE

P. Brown, Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982. Pp. vii + 347. $22.95.

J. Bregman, Synesius of Cyrene: Philosopher-Bishop. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982. Pp. xi + 206. $25.00.

K. Holum, Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982. Pp. xiv + 258. $25.00.

S. MacCormack, Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981. Pp. xvi + 417. $39.50.

I am no Nestor, but I can remember a time when late antiquity seemed a remote and forbidding area, something apparently invented by Bury and my own Professor E. A. Thompson, who seemed between them to have written all of the relevant books and articles, at any rate in English. This situation was owed not least to the fact that the late Roman centuries are also the opening of Byzantine history, a period only now recovering from the damage done to it by the scorn and contempt of Montesquieu, Voltaire, Hegel, Gibbon, and (it must be added) the apologetic tone that informs the writing of some of the best modern scholars especially with regard to its literature and intellectual history. The end product of all this is, of course, the sole and pejorative sense of the adjective "Byzantine" as used in the mass/crass media.

Things were never quite so bad with late Rome herself. Gibbon, for obvious instance, may have skated through Byzantine history proper in a single chapter, but he gave the bulk of his attention to what happened in the West. Modern attitudes are not always so good. The average textbook of Roman history will usually go down to 337. With varying degrees of enthusiasm. Still all too typical is the

experience of C. T. H. R. Ehrhardt, whose suitably wry account deserves to be quoted (it is equally significant that a classical journal in the last decade or so thought it deserved to be published):

"As a lecturer, I had always managed to keep off unknown ground, either staying safely among the Greeks or, at furthest, expatiating on the constitutional arrangements of Augustus. Now, however, I was cornered: I had to give a course on Roman imperial history to the death of Marcus Aurelius, and my ignorance was to be exposed."[1]

Just as revealing is the decision of the Oxford Latin Dictionary not to stray beyond the end of the second century A.D., thereby excluding Ammianus, the last important historian and stylist of Latin literature, Claudian his counterpart in poetry, the sometimes exotic Latin of the De Rebus Bellicis, one of whose words (delectabilitas) eluded the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, and the Historia Augusta, late antiquity's most enigmatic and controversial literary document.

But things have looked up enormously. The late Roman period is now widely recognised for what it was, one of the most momentous times of change in all history. Christianity, which is at the heart of all the books here under review, was imposed by Constantine in what Bury called "perhaps the most audacious act ever committed by an autocrat in disregard of the vast majority of his subjects".[2] True or false (there are those of us who would compare Lenin's imposition of his version of communism on the Russians), nothing would be the same again. Not that every aspect of Roman life changed overnight. And some would argue that Julian, had he lived longer, might have stopped the clock if not actually pushed it back. But his prompt replacement by the Christian Jovian, and the failure of any more

---

[1] C.T.H.R. Ehrhardt, "What should one do about Dacia?", Classical World 63 (1970) 222-5. The quotation is from page 222.

[2] J. B. Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire, I, 366.

Julians to appear (the problematic and abortive case of Eugenius apart) are the most telling comments.

In secular terms, whether we want to call the process one of decline, fall, being pushed, or whatever, the western empire was dismembered, the consequence being a significant redrawing of the map of Europe and the course of mediaeval history set in motion. In the East there came the Byzantines, Greek speakers who suggestively thought of themselves as the new Romans, and whose civilisation, whatever one thinks of it, lasted from almost a century before the Gothic capture of old Rome in 410 to within 50 years of the coming of Columbus to the Americas. This simple chronological fact should have made it a priori unlikely (despite Voltaire, Gibbon and company) that nothing of any interest happened. Yet the sketch of the history of Byzantine scholarship provided in the first chapter of Ostrogorsky's classic History of the Byzantine State discloses how relatively and reprehensibly recent that story is.

Perhaps the most cogent indication of how things have improved is that the period now attracts the attention and energies of some of the greatest figures in modern classical scholarship. Especially in the English-speaking world. For some generations, Bury and then Thompson looked relatively lonely amidst the European giants such as Seeck, Stein and their pupils. Not to mention the Russian (for obvious reasons, good and bad) tradition of scholarship in the field. But now in our own lifetime we benefit from the interest and writings of (for easy and quick instance - the list could have been a lot longer) A. H. M. Jones (The Later Roman Empire), Syme (his books on the Historia Augusta and ancillary papers), Momigliano (as characteristically energetic and erudite here as in all other periods), Robert Browning (many studies including a biography of Julian which I, unlike some reviewers, would call the best in a crowded field), Averil and Alan Cameron (a host of well-known and justly admired books and articles), and Peter Brown.

For it is no disrespect to the others to say that of the quartet under review Brown is the most celebrated and influential. His impact was first felt with a biography of St. Augustine (1967) that

opened many eyes to the possibility, soon to be established by Brown as a certainty, that the people of late antiquity were guided, often ruled, by recognisable passions and emotions. I myself can say this with glad sincerity as one who still finds Augustine an unattractive figure in human terms. A collection of cognate papers, definitively dotting and crossing many historical I's and T's, appeared in 1972 under the title Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine. A year before that had emerged a deceptively small and primer-looking volume, The World of Late Antiquity, as much a part of a scholar's library as of a required textbook shelf in a campus bookstore. More recently, Brown has brought out The Making of Late Antiquity (1978) and The Cult of the Saint (1981): both slim, both shining examples of multum in parvo.

And now the present volume. In addition to my own remarks, readers should consult the valuable and detailed reviews of R. I. Moore, Times Higher Education Supplement 30/7/82, and of R. A. Markus in the Times Literary Supplement of that same time. Also pertinent is E. D. Hunt, Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312-460 (Oxford, 1982), published after Brown; cf. Garth Fowden's detailed review in TLS 1/10/82.

The book is formally divided into two sections. The first, called "Approaches", offers two essays on Gibbon, an evaluation of Pirenne on Mohammed and Charlemagne, and an Inaugural Lecture on l'état de la question, as protreptic as all such exercises have to be, but a good deal more successful than most. Since one of the most legitimate functions of collecting a scholar's papers and pieces within expensive hardbacked covers, in an age when economic considerations often hinder young scholars from getting into print, is the inclusion of items not readily available in smaller and younger institutions, the presence of this lecture (given at Royal Holloway College in 1977) is welcome. As is the Stenton Lecture for 1976, on Relics and Social Status in the Age of Gregory of Tours, in the second and longer section entitled "Society and the Holy".

Here we are treated to various good things, for instance a critique of Browning's aforementioned book on Julian, even though at

times I personally find it too severe; and one of his most controversial articles, that on Iconoclasm and its causes.[3] But the jewel of the collection must be "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity,"[4] a study that has spawned many imitations, including most recently Garth Fowden's "The Pagan Holy Man in Late Antiquity"[5] and which now has the added advantage of being denounced by G. de Ste. Croix for being "marred by blindness to the realities of the Class Struggle in the later Roman Empire".[6] The pillar saints and their (in Gibbon's matchless phrase) aerial penance were an unlovely phenomenon, albeit their inspiration of Luis Bunel's film St. Simeon of the Red Desert makes me glad they existed! But Brown's relentless combing of the hagiographical sources (he can even establish the number of consecutive pushups performed by one holy fool - 1244, and without legwarmers!) produces a remarkably rational account of the irrational.

There are not many specific targets at which to take aim. I find B's style sometimes woolly (e.g. "The category of popular religion is, by definition, timeless and faceless, because it exhibits modes of thinking that are unintelligible except in terms of failure to be something else," 12), sometimes overripe (e.g. "the shimmering presence of a bodiless power, whose function identified it with the vast and tranquil hierarchy of the universe," 14). Seemingly incompatible conclusions are drawn from the effects of youthful loneliness upon Julian (21, 91), although this sort of inconsistency is inevitable in a collection of papers encompassing a good quinquennium, and it is a poor scholar who cannot change his mind. B's retention of faith in the "Letters" of Nilus (147, n. 231) is hard to follow after Alan Cameron's demolition job in GRBS 17 (1976). The index of names is not always reliable; for instance, the Henry James quotation is on 202, not 201; it actually occurs first on 138, but this appearance is not indexed.

---

[3] English Historical Review 88 (1973) 1-34.

[4] Journal of Roman Studies 61 (1971) 80-101.

[5] Journal of Hellenic Studies 102 (1982) 33-59.

[6] G. de Ste. Croix, The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World (London, 1981), 447.

But these are relative trivia. Few scholars really alter the thinking of their scholarly colleagues (or, all too often, rivals). Peter Brown is one of the élite who has. One only has to observe the plethora of allusions to his work by the various scholars who make up S. Haeckel (ed.), The Byzantine Saint (Birmingham, 1981). Whatever the disagreements over detail, these Brown studies are, and will continue to be, central to all other considerations of late antiquity. In his memorable book on Tertullian, T. D. Barnes expressed the hope that he could do for a church father what others had done for pagan sophists--an ambition he admirably realised. Nowadays, the process is reversed: what Brown has done is to write the emotional history of late Rome, something we now need for the earlier periods.

If Bregman's book is perhaps the least exciting of the quartet, that is more the fault of his subject than himself. For as Dr. Johnson once said of Gray, Synesius is not only dull in himself but the cause of dullness in others, though he could hit off the occasional good line, as when he likened the lifestyle of the emperor Arcadius to that of a mollusc. Synesius is only interesting as a symbol of the transformation of the classical heritage that gives the series begun by these four books its title. But if Bregman overvalues his subject, that is a sin of which we are all probably guilty. His detailed assessment of the life and "thought" of this hellenising christian (or do I mean christianising hellene?) sets out the salient information, and the generous provision of extensive English translations of the Greek makes that information accessible to all types of reader.

Some details. 4, n. 6: on the identification of characters in the De Providentia, cf. Jones, JRS 54 (1964), 79; 17 f: B's discussion of Synesius' career and dates was apparently written before the second volume of PLRE came out, albeit that event predates B's publication date by two years; 18: on pagan survivals in the teeth of imperial legislation, cf. A. Frantz, DOP 19 (1965); 20, n. 14: on Hypatia, see J. Rist, Phoenix 19 (1965); 41: by now (cf. 3, 18) Synesius has been three times described as a Xenophontine man of hunting and letters! 44: Eunapius could have been brought into the discussion of teachers, students, and respective religious affiliations, since that ardent pagan had masters of both persuasions; 50 f: B's account of Synesius at Constantinople and the complex history of that period unaccountably ignores Alan

Cameron's Claudian, a mine of relevant information; 54, n 3: Menander Rhetor is now available with translation and commentary in the edition of D. A. Russell & N.G. Wilson (Oxford, 1980); 56, n. 48: B's generalised scorn of fourth-century conservatism in economic matters ought to be tempered by the revolutionary ideas of such as the anonymous De Rebus Bellicis--even if they were not acted upon, the fact of their existence is significant; 72: on "Perses" and the Hand of God, see both Holum and MacCormack below, also R. C. Blockley, The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire (Liverpool, 1981), 161; 125: the sentence on hellenism and paganism could mislead the unwary; 127: B on Macrobius neglects Alan Cameron's change of date for him in JRS 56 (1966); 132, n. 9: for Jerome and Christian criticism of monks, cf. D. Wiesen, St. Jerome as a Satirist; 138 f: Lucian is oddly missing from B's account of the Second Sophistic.

Kenneth Holum's beautifully written book (beautifully produced, too, apart from a notable reluctance to put accents on French words, 55, 67, 73, and passim, and one glorious misprint--"wontonly", 11, n. 18--that will delight lovers of Chinese food) would surprise, and should delight, feminists at what Byzantine women were able to achieve. The princesses he deals with set the stage for Theodora (notably one of the ancient women included in Judy Chicago's The Dinner Party), and after her individuals such as Irene who (not uniquely) ruled in her own name--something that never happened in pagan Rome. Irene was an iron lady in more than one sense (she had her own son blinded), and was less congenial than Margaret Thatcher, the modern holder of that title, but the point is not thereby affected.

Where the late Stewart Irwin Oost (Holum's teacher) had led with his Galla Placidia Augusta (Chicago, 1968), Holum both follows and establishes new directions of his own. The title implies a biographical approach, and to my taste there is nothing wrong with that; but those who agree with Syme that this genre is "cheap and easy" will be consoled to find that the broader issues of foreign affairs, statesmanship (Holum to his eternal credit does not say "statespersonship"!), and religion are given their due. Too much, perhaps, in this last category, since a good deal of what Holum has to say about John Chrysostom (73 f., 147 f.) or the Nestorian Controversy was largely anticipated in T. E. Gregory, Vox Populi:

Violence and Popular Involvement in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D. (Columbus, 1979), a work not cited by Holum who had no doubt completed his own before it appeared. His readers will also need a copy of Alan Cameron's "The empress and the poet: paganism and politics at the court of Theodosius II," YCS 27 (1982), 217-90, since parts of Holum's book constitute a friendly polemic with it. At the risk of pallid neutrality, I can only say that I sometimes agree with one, sometimes the other, over points of interpretation. In one matter, however, that of the poetry and theological "thought" of Cyrus of Panopolis (193, n. 79), I had reached a conclusion that supports Holum.[7]

At centre stage for much of the time are Aelia Eudoxia, empress of Arcadius; her daughter Aelia Pulcheria, a rancid virgin (of her own choice) who ruled the imperial roost for much of the long reign of Theodosius II; and Aelia Eudocia, née Athenais, whose personal history encapsulates the conflicts between pagan and christian hellenism, and who to my taste is the most interesting of them all. Apart from Holum and Cameron, who from their respective viewpoints give her full measure, readers might sometimes enjoy J. Tsatsos, Athénais: Impératrice de Byzance (French version by M. Colombos, Paris, 1976), an opuscule not mentioned by Holum. Just as Brown shows how Christianity at various intellectual levels prefigures the Byzantine shape of things to come, and Bregman the co-existence within one man of the old hellenism and the new, so Holum shows how these women, Pulcheria above all, transformed the basileia into its future mould.

A few points. 1: H gives no reason for clinging to 434 as the date of Honoria's affair with Eugenius as opposed to the 449 of Bury (LRE² 1. 289, n. 2), followed by PLRE; 11: I do not see why H calls the verse inscription to Theodosius "remarkable", which it is not--cf. parallels in the Anthology with Cameron's discussions in his Porphyrius the Charioteer--especially as H himself goes on to call its imagery "traditional" in the very same sentence; 30, n. 86: Elagabalus' mother is better called Soaemias, as witness Magie's note on

[7] Vig. Christ. 36 (1982) 169-172.

Elag. 2. 1 in his Loeb edition of the HA, along with ibid. 12. 3-4 where the story changes to the grandmother Maesa; 51: see above and below for Perses and the Hand of God; 92: the isolation of Theodosius II was no more "mysterious" than that of Arcadius, or indeed many another late emperor; 100: H's date of 423 for Eunapius, fr. 87, based on Paschoud, Cinq Etudes sur Zosime (1975), 173-5, is spuriously precise. For the complex issue of Eunapian literary chronology, cf. Blockley, op. cit., 5 f, also Barnes, The Sources of the Historia Augusta (1978), 114-7; 116: H's contention that Theodosius would not have concerned himself with Leontius and the chair of rhetoric at Athens does not square with that emperor's notorious concern with scholarship and piety; 140: H downplays quite seriously the role of women in the early church, though the evidence is presented and discussed by D. J. Constantelos, Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare (1968), 84-6, a work actually cited in H's bibliography; 191, n. 74: H says that the office of praepositus is not attested for Chrysaphius but that he probably held it anyway. In point of fact, it is attested in both Greek (Suda P 898, from Malalas) and Latin (Prosper Tiro and Victor Tunnensis) sources, but is not believed in by, e.g., PLRE; 207: also on Chrysaphius, H accepts the late evidence of Theophanes, Zonaras, and the like for the eunuch's exiling by Theodosius, a claim regarded by PLRE as "certainly false"--H might be right on this and other controversies signalled above, but the view presented tends to be misleadingly clear.

Sabine MacCormack's book is by far the biggest of the four, perhaps suitably for a work based on the Panegyrici Latini. Other reviewers, both sympathetic[8] and hostile,[9] have complained about her tendency to write in the abominable style of her subjects, with sentences up to nine lines long and some opacity of meaning; but this was perhaps an inevitable contagion. Her book is deemed too long by these same critics, a Callimachean attitude that is justified up to a point. The text itself (1-175) might have benefited from a less indulgent sub-editor, and there are times when one feels MacCormack had already made her point far more economically in two excellent articles.[10] Since some of their topics overlap, I feel justified in noting the same reaction in the case of Fergus Millar, when comparing

---

[8]T. E. Gregory, American Historical Review 87 (1982) 1373-4.

[9]J. Trilling, Times Literary Supplement, 13 Aug. 1982.

[10]"Roma, Constantinopolis, the Emperor, and his Genius", Classical

the precision of his paper "Emperors at Work"[11] with the brobdingnagian Emperor in the Roman World (1977). However, the text is followed by notes that occupy 101 pages, along with a further 21 of bibliography. Ordinarily, this would be an offputting example of the foot and note disease, but what MacCormack has done, quite rightly as I think, is to supply a rich repertoire of texts, often from out of the way authors in editions not always easily come by. This amounts to a sourcebook in itself, and a very valuable one.

MacCormack's subject is the threefold one of imperial accession, adventus, and consecratio, and how these were described in both art and literature. In a word, tradition. Thanks to the verbal excesses of the Latin panegyricists, the subject can seem superficially boring, especially perhaps in the New World that was partly founded on breakaway from the Old. But it may be better to adapt one of Kingsley Amis' wisest epigrams and observe that other people's traditions are endlessly odd. What MacCormack has attempted to show is (in her own words of epilogue, 275) that the ideas and their expression with which she deals lead directly from the pagan and classical to the Christian and mediaeval, both in the west and the east. Some inevitable disagreements over detail apart, it seems to me that MacCormack has produced a compelling and convincing account.

Details. Trilling in his TLS review criticises M frequently for her choice and treatment of works of art. I am no art historian, hence will merely alert readers to this issue; the item he picks out from 38 (+ plate 47) certainly looks odd even to my untrained eye. 1: M begins beautifully with a quotation from St. Augustine expressing his qualms over the polite and public lies expected of a professor eulogising those in authority--a cynic might extend the point to our own times! It should certainly be kept in mind when assessing Eunapius, Julian, Dioscorus of Aphrodito, and the other ancients cited by M throughout the book. In this opening section along with concomitant notes and bibliography, M had no doubt finished her work before the appearance of a series of good papers by C. E. V. Nixon in Antichthon 14 (1980), Phoenix 35 (1981), and

---

Quarterly 25 (1975) 131-150; "Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity", Hjstoria 21 (1972) 721-732.

[11] Journal of Roman Studies 57 (1967) 9-19.

TAPhA 111 (1981) which her readers should consult; 4 + n. 12: M must have finished before the Russell-Wilson edition of Menander came out; 9 + n. 23: M neglects to mention that Stertz's article on the Eis basilea is in fact an attack on C. P. Jones' ascription of it (JRS 62, 1972) to Aelius Aristides--Jones replied to Stertz in CQ 31 (1981); 11: on the recurring matter of Perses and the Hand of God, note that Blockley, op. cit., 161, attaches the incident to old Rome, whereas M, also Holum 51, puts it in Constantinople; 31 (cf. 43): see Trilling for criticism of M's handling of the artistic evidence; 42: Trajan (cf. Philostratus, VS 488) is an earlier example of an emperor riding in golden chariots; 59 + n. 226: the image of an emperor's trampling foot is also common in Byzantine epigrams of the Anthology; 63: Sidonius' single venisti might consciously echo Julius Caesar's famous veni, vidi, vici; 68 + n. 271: Heitsch's edition came out in 1963, not 1961: and why not give the author's name for the panegyric in question, the hapless Dioscorus of Aphrodito. M's discussion (she is not alone in this) underrates the pathos of a situation whereby some parts of the empire never saw any more of their ruler than his images; 77 + n. 304: M overlooks the discussion of Justinian's Augustaeum statue by Downey in the 7th vol. of Dewing's Loeb of Procopius; 79: Liutprand was certainly a hostile witness, but not "uncomprehending"--he belittles in the spirit of one who had come determined not to be impressed; 103: Nero was surely not as concerned to claim divinity as M says. He was openly contemptuous of all cults, and significantly described his Golden House as fit for a man to live in (Suetonius, N 31, 56); 118: in the light of the Apocolocyntosis of Seneca or Severus' deification of Commodus, M perhaps exaggerates the degree to which Romans had taken consecratio seriously; 150: the sentence beginning "As a result..." makes no grammatical sense; 162 + n. 7: the reference to Shahid on Heraclius and imperial terminology can now be updated to include his recent paper in DOP 34/5 (1980/81); 199: sidus novus is presumably a misprint, as opressisset, 295, n. 165; 234 + n. 340: on royal long hair, cf. Averil Cameron, Revue Belge 48 (1965); 243: M says the acclamations for Marcian are not reported, an error redeemed on 245 where, however, their political side (Reign like Marcian! Cast Out the Informers! Restore the Army!) is neglected; 249: Calinius is an error for Calinicus; 300: on the Circus Dialogue, cf. Alan Cameron, Circus Factions (1978), 318 f. for translation and commentary, also P. Karlin-Hayter, Byzantion 43 (1973), and my own paper in Rev. Et. Byz. 39 (1981).

These books are all expensive, capriciously so in that Bregman's costs more than Brown's, albeit almost half its size! That is the way of the modern publishing world. But we do have the powerful consolations that they are handsomely produced, a joy to hand and eye, and in content well worth the bank loan needed to afford them.

INDEX

Page numbers refer to the original page numbers within each article

Acerronia: XLII 133

Achilles Tatius: LV 115-7; LX 325

Acte: XLII 129, 131; XLIV 85, 97

Aegialus: XLV 44

Aelius Aristides: LXXXI 173, 181-2, 184; LXXXII 67

Aemilianus Maurus: LXV 39-40

Aeschines: LXIII 58

Agathias: X 183; XI 339, 342; XV 12; LIV 126; LVII 167-8; LX 339; LXX 30

Agricola: XLI 71, 72-4, 76, 79-81; XLII 139; XLIV 83-4, 90, 92, 97; LXVIII
154, 161

Agrippina: XVIII 133; XIX 43-4, 48; XL 426-33; XLI 79; XLII 129-34; XLIV
86-7, 89-90, 96-7; LXVII 196

Albinovanus Pedo: LXXX 172

Alceides of Alexandria: LXV 41

Alcibiades: IV 154-6; V 41-4; XXXII 294; LXIV 27; LXV 41

Alciphron: XI 339, 341-2; LXII 253-4; LXXI 57

Ammianus Marcellinus: XI 337; LVII 167; LXVII 202-3; LXIX 104; LXX 29;
LXXXI 178-9; LXXXII 58

Androcles: IV 155; V 41-3, 47

Anicetus: XLI 77; XLII 129-34, 143

Antiatticistes: LII 60; LIV 123

Antistius Sosianus: XL 435-6, 438; XLI 75-6, 78; XLII 140-1; LXVIII 149, 1

Antoninus Pius: LXVII 150, 163; LXIX 104; LXXII 408; LXXXI 174

Apicius: XXXIV 252

Appian: LXVI 289-92; LXXXI 182

Apuleius: XXXIII 120; XLVI 1-3; XLIX 106; LI 6-8; LVI 175; LXV 40; LXXXI 182-3

Aratus: LXXX 165-72

Areius: LXXI 55

Arethas: LVII 167; LXI 227, 233

Aristonicus: LXVI 293

Aristophanes: IV 151-5; V 35-9, 43, 45; VI 43; VII 80; VIII 358; IX 147; XIV 148; XV 10; XVII 28, 30-2, 35, 40; XXXII 294; LIV 119, 121; LX 328, 330, 333-4, 337

Aristotle: V 37, 40, 41; LVI 175; LVII 165-6

Arrian: LXV 41-2; LXXXI 182

Asclepiades: VIII 358; IX 145-9; X 183; XIV 147-8

Asconius: LXVII 193-4

Athenaeus: V 38; VII 79; VIII 358; IX 146-7; XI 346; XII 96-7; XXI 94; XXXIV 252-3; XLIX 107; LVI 174-5; LXIV 21-42; LXV 37-48 LXXII 408; LXXXI 183

Augustine: XVII 41-2; LXXIV 76; LXXXII 56-60

Augustus: XVII 29, 33, 37; XIX 40-1; XXI 96; XXVI 46; XLI 79-80; XLII 130; XLIV 94; LVIII 49; LXIV 26; LXVII 194-5; LXVIII 153, 157-9; LXX 29; LXXI 55; LXXIII 256

Aulus Gellius: II 34; XVIII 133; XXIII 35; XXXVIII 162-3; XLiii 149; XLV 43; XLVI 3; XLIX 103-7; L 22-7; LI 5-13; LIII 330; LIV 119, 126; LVI 175; LXI 226; LXIV 31, 38; LXVIII 160; LXXXI 174-5, 185-6

Aurelian: LXXII 406, 408

Avidius Cassius: XXXVIII 162; LIX 213; LXVIII 161

Balbilla: LXXI 55

Barea Soranus: XL 438-9; XLI 74

Basilius of Adada: LXI 221, 233

Blossius of Cumae: LXVI 293

Brasidas: III 212-4

Britannicus: XIX 44, 48; XXV 363; XL 427, 429; XLII 132

Burrus: XVIII 134; XIX 44; XX 187-8; XL 430-6, 439; XLI 70,77; XLII 133-4, 136-7, 142; XLIV 87

Caligula: XL 426-7; XLIV 85, 95; LXIV 23; LXVII 195; LXVIII 155-7; LXIX 104

Callimorphus: LIX 212-3

Calpurnius Siculus: LXXX 171; LXXXI 183-4

Cato the elder: XVI 462; XVII 29, 33; XVIII 137; XXXVIII 162-3; LXXIX 785, 787, 791

Catullus: XIV 146; XV 9-13; XVI 465; XVII 39; L 22; LI 6, 8

Cephalion: II 32

Charminus: IV 154-5; V 36

Christians: XXXVIII 162-4; XL 437; XLII 143; XLIV 85; XLVI 1-3; LIII 327; LV 118; LVII 167-8; LX 321, 325, 328, 332-4, 336, 338, 341-2; LXV 38; LXVII 202; LXVIII 150, 152, 159; LXX 29; LXXXI 176, 185, 188-9; LXXXII 57-68

Chronographer of the Year 354: LXXII 406-8

Cicero: I 176; XI 345; XVII 33, 39-40; XXI 89-90, 96; XXIV 174-5; XXVI 46; XXVIII 402; XXXVIII 162; XLI 80; XLII 133; XLIII 146, 148; XLV 43; LI 7-8; LIII 320, 323; LIV 121; LV 118; LVI 175; LVII 166; LXVI 294; LXVII

190-4, 200, 203; LXVIII 150-1, 163; LXIX 103-4; LXX 28; LXXX 164, 167-9

Claudius: XIX 39-48; XXI 88; XXV 363; XXXVII 113; XL 426-9, 432, 438; XLI 79; XLII 131-2, 144; XLIV 87, 96; LXVII 195-6, 200; LXVII 155, 157-8; LXIX 104; LXXX 166

Cleon: III 211-4; IV 153-5; V 35-40, 43; XLIV 91

Cleopatra: LXXVIII 181-2

Cleophon: IV 154-4; V 35-47

Cluvienus: XXXV 305, 309, 312; XXXVI 103-4; XLII 130

Cluvius Rufus: XL 431; XLI 71-2

Columella: XXI 93; LXXIX 785-91

Commodus: LXIV 22-6, 36, 40-1; LXV 45-6; LXVII 200-2; LXVIII 155, 159; LXX 29; LXXIV 275; LXXXI 175; LXXXII 67

Cordus/Codrus: XXXVI 102-3

Crassus: LXVI 289-92, 294

Cratinus: IV 151, 153; V 38

Crepereius Calpurnianus: LIX 211-3

Crispinus: XXXV 306, 309; XXXVII 109-14

Crixus: LXVI 290-2, 294

Cynulcus: LXV 42

Demosthenes: III 214; XVII 30, 33, 39; LII 54-62; LVI 174; LXIII 58

Dio Cassius: XVIII 133-4, 138; XIX 39-48; XX 188; XXXIX 59; XL 426-7, 431-3; XLI 80; XLII 133, 135, 142; XLIV 85,96; XLVII 380-1; LIV 117; LVIII 49; LXII 253; LXIV 22-3, 27, 33, 36; LXV 39-40, 42, 48; LXVII

194-6, 198; LXVIII 151l; LXX 29; LXXI 54; LXXII 408; LXXVIII 182; LXXX 165; LXXXI 175, 178

Dio Chrysostom: LXXXI 184

Diodorus Siculus: III 214; V 43-4; LXVI 291, 293

Dioscorides: VIII 357-8; XI 345

Dioscorus of Aphrodito: XI 341, 345; XII 98; XV 11; LXXXII 66-7

Domitian: XXV 306, 310; XXXVIII 109-14; XXXVIII 163; XXXIX 59-60; XL 425; XLI 70-2, 74-6, 80-1; XLIV 91; LXVII 196; LXVIII 154, 157, 163; LXIX 103-4; LXXI 56; LXXII 408; LXXX 166-7

Echion: XXXI 327-8; XXXIV 253; LXX 29

Endius: V 44, 46-7

Eunapius: XXIX 54; LVII 167; LXXXII 62, 66

Eunus: LXVI 293

Eupolis: IV 151, 153-4; V 38, 45

Euripides: V 39-40; XI 339; XVII 31; XXXIV 252-3; XLIII 147; XLVII 380-1; LX 331; LXI 224

Europa: LV 115-9

Fabius Rusticus: XL 431

Fabricius Veiento: XVIII 135; XXXV 309-10; XL 436; XLI 70, 75-6, 81; XLII 140-2; LXVIII 149, 163

Faenius Rufus: XVIII 134; XX 168; XL 437-9; XLI 73, 77; XLII 137; XLIV 85

Faustus Cornelius Sulla: XL 432-3; XLI 79; XLII 142

Favorinus: XLIX 103-5, 107; L 22-4; LI 6, 9-10; LIV 119, 126: LXVIII 160

Florus: LXVI 289-92; LXXXI 184

Frontinus: XLI 71-2; XLII 140; LXXX 166

Fronto: XLIII 150; XLV 43; XLVI 2; XLIX 104-6; L 22-3; LIV 119, 123, 126; LVI 175; LVII 167; LIX 213; LXIV 31; LXVIII 149-50; LXX 29; LXXXI 180, 184

Galen: XV 12; L 22; LIII 319-20; LIV 119, 123-4, 126; LV 175; LIX 211; LXIII 58-9; LXIV 22-5, 28, 30, 34-6, 41-2; LXV 38, 43, 47; LXIX 105; LXXXI 185

Germanicus: XLI 81; XLII 134; XLIV 89, 94-5; LXVIII 154, 158; LXXI 54; LXXX 163-72

Gregory Nazianzenus: XI 338, 340, 345; XII 96-9; LX 337

Gregory of Nyssa: X 183; XI 339, 343; XII 98; LXX 30

Hadrian: XXXV 311; XLIX 103-4; L 22; LI 7-8; LIII 335; LIV 117-8. 120-1, 126; LXIV 25-9; LXV 40, 46; LXVIII 158-60, 162; LXXI 54-5; LXXXI 175, 179, 184

Helius: XL 426-7; XLV 44

Helvidius Priscus: XXXVI 104; XXXIX 59; XLI 74; LXVIII 156

Hermippus: IV 151, 153

Herodes Atticus: XLIX 104-6; LIV 118; LXIV 31; LXV 37; LXVIII 160-1

Herodian: LIX 213; LXII 253; LXIV 33, 36; LXV 42; LXXI 54; LXXXI 178

Herodotus: I 167-77; II 31-2; VI 43; LXXI 56

Hesychius: VII 80; VIII 359; X 183; XI 338

Himerius: V 41

Historia Augusta: II 34; XIII 25; XVIII 136; XXXVIII 162; XLI 80; LIX 213;

LXII 253; LXIV 23, 26-8, 32-3, 36, 38-9, 42; LXV 37, 40, 44-5, 48; LXVII 189-90, 194-5, 200-2; LXVIII 162; LXIX 105; LXXI 54; LXXII 406-9; LXXXI 177-8

Horace: XIV 147; XVI 460-5; XVII 33, 39; XXXV 305, 309-12; XXXVII 110; XXXIX 59; XLII 137, 144; XLII 144-50; XLV 43; L 22; LI 8; LV 116-8; LXXXVI 122-3; LXXVII 280; LXXVIII 182; LXXXI 179

Hyperbolus: IV 151-6; V 35-7, 39-43, 47

Isidore of Seville: II 34; XXVII 145; XXVIII 402-3; XXXVIII 162

John Lydus: XXIX 54; XXXVII 112; XXXIX 58; XLVI 3; LXXX 164

Julian: LX 322, 332-4, 342-4; LXXXII 58-9, 61, 66

Julius Caesar: LI 10; LVII 167; LXVII 189-91, 194; LXVIII 150; LXIX 103; LXXX 163-5

Juvenal: XV 9, 11; XVII 32-5; XVIII 137; XXI 89, 92, 94, 97; XXIV 175; XXIX 54; XXXIII 120; XXXV 304-12; XXXVI 101-4; XXXVII 109-14; XXXVIII 162-4; XXXIX 57-60; XLI 76, 78; XLII 130, 138; XLIII 145, 149; XLIV 83, 91, 93; LIV 120; LXVII 198-200, 203; LXVIII 149-51, 154-5, 157; LXX 28-9; LXXI 54, 57; LXXII 407; LXXIII 256, 260; LXXXI 178, 180, 186

Larensis: LXIV 23-5, 36-8; LXV 37-8, 44

Libanius: LIV 119, 125

Liudprand of Cremona: VIII 357

Livia: XXI 88, 92-3, 96-7; XLIV 89, 94; LXVII 196

Locusta: XXV 363; XXXV 307; XXXIX 57-9; XL 427; XLIV 89

Lollianus: LXXXI 181

Lucan: XVIII 137-8; XL 437-8; XLII 144; XLIII 144-5, 147; XLIV 97; LXXX 164

Lucian: I 176; II 32; III 152; VII 80; VIII 359; X 183; XI 338-9, 344; XII 95-7; XV 9-10; XVII 138; XXI 87, 94; XLIX 104, 106-7; L 22; LII 54-62; LIII 311-35; LIV 117-26; LV 115-9; LVI 174-6; LVII 165-8; LVIII 49-50; LIX 211-3; LX 321-44; LXI 219-34; LXII 253; LXIII 58-9; LXIV 31, 34-5, 38, 41-2; LXV 41, 46; LXVIII 160; LXXI 54-5, 57; LXXIV 275; LXXXI 174, 181, 185-7

Lucilius: XVI 464; XXXV 305, 311; XXXIX 59; LXXVI 122-3

Lucillius: LIII 321, 325-8, 330, 332, 334

Lucretius: XVI 460-1; XXXVIII 164; XLII 137; XLV 43; LXXVII 280

Luxorius: XIII 25

Lysias: V 39, 41, 43, 45-6

Lysicles: V 36-7, 39

Maecenas: XXI 88, 96; XXIII 35-6; XXVIII 402-3

Malchus of Philadelphia: LVII 167-8

Mannicius: XXX 377

Marcus Aurelius: XI 337; XLIII 150; XLIX 105, 107; LIV 118-9, 121-2, 124; LVI 175; LVII 166; LIX 213; LXIII 58; LXIV 24-5, 41; LXVII 201; LXVIII 159, 161, 163; LXIX 103; LXX 29; LXXII 408; LXXIII 256; LXXXI 184-5, 187

Martial: VII 80; VIII 357; XIII 25; XV 9-10, 12; XVI 461; XVII 39-40; XXI 89; XXIV 175; XXVIII 403; XXXIII 120; XXXV 305; XXXVI 101-3; XXXVII 109, 111, 113-4; XXXIX 57; XLIV 91; LXVIII 162

Masurius: LXV 45

Maternus: XVIII 139

Memmius Regulus: XL 437; XLI 71, 73; XLII 140

Memnon: LXII 253; LXXI 53-7

Menander: LXII 253; LXXI 57

Menippus: LIII 320-1; LIV 119, 123; LXIV 38; LXVIII 160

Messalina: XIX 40-8; XL 427, 430; XLIV 86-7, 93-7

Michael Italicus: LXIII 59

Moeris: LII 60

Moschus: VII 79; LV 115-9

Myrtilus: LXV 45-6

Narcissus: XIX 41-2; 44-5; XL 428-9

Nero: XVIII 133-40; XIX 40, 42, 44-8; XX 187-8; XXI 88, 97; XXIII 35-6; XXV 363; XXIX 54, 56; XXXII 294; XXXV 306-7, 312; XXXVII 113-4; XXXIX 57-8; XL 425-39; XLI 70, 72-8, 81; XLII 128-44; XLIII 145; XLIV 85-7, 89-90; XLV 44; XLVI 3; XLVII 380-1; LXIV 22; LXVIII 149, 151-9; LXIX 105; LXX 29; LXXI 56; LXXII 406-7; LXXX 166, 171; LXXXI 183; LXXXII 67

Nerva: XVIII 138; XLT 72, 75-6, 80-1; LXVIII 149, 152, 161-3; LXXI 56; LXXX 166

Nicarchus: VII 79

Nicephorus Phocas: LX 323-6, 335, 344

Nicias: III 213; IV 154-6; V 41

Nigra: XIV 145-8

Nonnus: X 182-3; XI 340-6; XII 95-9

Octavia: XL 429, 435-6; XLI 77-8; XLII 129, 142-4; XLIV 86, 97; LXVIII 153-4, 162

Opimius: XXIV 173-5

Ovid: VIII 358; X 182-3; XI 343; XIV 147; XVI 460, 465; XVII 37, 39; XXXV 37, 39; XLIII 148; LV 116-8; LXXX 167, 170-2; LXXXI 179

Palladas: VII 80; XI 337; XLVI 2; LXV 40

Pancrates: LXIV 27

Pedanius Secundus: LXVIII 152-3, 159

Peregrinus Proteus: XLIX 104, 106; LXI 225-6; LXVIII 160; LXXIV 275

Pericles: IV 155; C 38, 43; XVII 31

Persius: XIV 147; XVIII 138; XXVIII 403; XXXV 307, 311; XXXVII 110

Petronius: XV 10; XVII 37-8; XVIII 133-40; XXI 87-97; XXII 294-6; XXIII 35-6; XXIV 173-5; XXV 363; XXVI 46-7; XXVIII 402-3; XXIX 53-7; XXX 377-8; XXXI 327-8; XXXII 293-4; XXXIII 119-21; XXXIV 252-3; XXXIX 57; XL 438; XLI 72, 78; XLIII 149; XLIV 89; LI 9, 12; LIV 126; LXV 41; LXVII 199, 201; LXVIII 150, 161; LXX 29

Petronius Turpilianus: XVIII 138-9; XLI 72-4; XLII 139

Philostratus: XLIX 103-7; LI 10; LIII 328; LIV 118, 126; LXIV 22, 26, 28, 30, 39-40, 42; LXV 37-8, 41, 43, 46-8; LXVIII 151; LXXI 53; LXXXI 180-1; LXXXII 67

Photius: II 32; LIII 319; LIV 118, 123, 125; LXXXI 178

Phrynichus, grammarian: LII 60; LIV 119-20, 123, 126; LVI 175; LXI 230; LXIV 35; LXV 46

Piso, conspirator: XVIII 135-6; XX 188; XL 437-9; XLI 72, 77; XLII 143; LXVIII 156, 163; LXIX 103-4

Plato: XVII 29, 31, 35, 40; XVIII 294; LI 5, 9, 11; LXV 41

Plato comicus: IV 151, 153-5; V 37, 39

Plautus: XIV 147; XV 10; XXI 91; XXVII 145; XLII 138; XLIII 147; LI 6-8

Pliny the elder: XIV 146; XV 11; XVIII 135; XXI 93; XXIV 174-5; XXVI 46-7; XXXVI 101; XLIII 146-7; XLV 44; XLIX 104; LXVII 190, 195, 197-9; LXX 29; LXXI 29; LXXI 53; LXXV 18-20; LXXIX 785-6; LXXX 167; LXXXI 181

Pliny the younger: II 34; XVIII 137; XXI 88, 90, 96; XXVI 47; XXXV 305-6, 310; XXXVI 101; XXXVII 112; XXXVIII 163; XXXIX 59; XLI 70-1, 76, 80-1; XLIII 145, 148; XLIV 84, 91-3, 97; XLVI 2; LXVII 194-5, 197; LXVIII 149, 153, 161; LXIX 105; LXX 28; LXXX 165; LXXXI 187

Plutarch: I 167, 176; III 231; IV 152-4; V 39; XII 97; XVII 35, 37; XXI 97; LVII 166; LVII 49; LXV 47; LXVI 289-92; LXVII 196; LXXV 19; LXXVIII 182; LXXXI 187-8

Pompey: LXVI 292; LXVII 193; LXIX 102-3

Poppaea: XXI 88; XL 434, 437-8; XLI 76-7; XLII 129-30, 142, 144; XLIV 86-8, 97; LXVIII 154

Procopius of Caesarea: LXX 29-30

Propertius: XIV 146; LI 6; LXXVIII 182

Psellus: LX 326, 343

Publilius Syrus: XXVIII 402

Quintilian: XV 10; XVIII 133; XXVII 145; XXVIII 145, 149-50; LI 7; LII 54; LIV 120, 123; LXVII 200; LXXXI 179

Remmius Palaemon: XVIII 138

Romanus Hispo: XVIII 135; XX 188; XL 437; XLI 77; XLII 143

Rubellius Plautus: XL 431-3, 438; XLI 74, 79; XLII 142; XLIV 84; XLVII 380

Rufinus: VIII 358; X 192-4; XI 337-46; XII 96

Sallust: LXVI 289-90

Sappho: XVII 35-6

Sempronius Asellio: II 34

Seneca the younger: XVIII 133-40; XIX 39-48; XX 187-8; XXI 93-4; XXVIII 402-3; XXXV 306; XXXVIII 162; XL 427, 429, 431-4, 437-8; XLII 129, 133-4, 143-4; XLIV 96-7; XLV 44; L 24; LXVII 200; LXVIII 150, 153, 161: LXXIII 256; LXXXII 67

Septimius Severus: LXII 253; LXV 40; LXIX 103; LXXI 53-4, 57

Servius: II 34; LX 335

Sidonius Apollinaris: XXII 295; XXXIX 57

Silani: XL 426-31, 437, 439; XLII 143; XLIV 87, 89-90

Silius Italicus: XVIII 137-8; XLI 72; XLIII 145; LXVIII 161

Silvinus: LXXXIX 787, 790-1

Solon: VII 80; XVII 28

Spartacus: LXV 289-94; LXIX 103

Statius: XXXVII 109, 112; XLIII 145; XLV 43; LXXX 166

Strabo: I 171-3; LXXI 53, 56-7

Strato: XXXIII 121; LIII 321, 335; LIV 117, 126

Suda: II 32; X 183; XII 97; XIV 148; XVIII 138; XXIX 57; XLIX 103-4; LI 10; LXI 224 LXIV 22, 24-5, 34; LXV 42; LXXX 164-5

Suetonius: XIII 25; XVIII 135; XIX 39-48; XXI 95; XXXV 310; XXXVI 104; XXXVIII 162-3; XXXIX 38-9; XL 426, 432-3, 437; XLI 80-1; XLII 131, 136-7, 141; XLIII 149; XLIV 85; XLVII 380; LVIII 49; LXIV 41; LXVII

189-91, 194-6, 200; LXVIII 155-6, 158, 162; LXIX 104; LXXII 406-9; LXXVIII 182; LXXX 165, 167-70; LXXXI 188

Suetonius Paulinus: XLI 72-4; XLII 129, 139

Suillius: XVIII 133-4; XIX 40, 45-8; XL 434

Symmachus: LXVII 203; LXII 408

Synesius: LXXXII 62-3

Tacitus: I 173, 176; II 33-4; XVIII 133-40; XIX 39-48; XX 187-8; XXI 95; XXIII 35-6; XXV 363; XXX 378; XXXV 306, 310; XXXIX 58; XL 425-39; XLI 70-81; XLII 128-44; XLIII 144-50; XLIV 83-101; XLV 43-4; XLVI 1-3; XLVII 380-1; XLVIII 322-3; LVII 167; LXIV 41; LXVII 191, 194, 196-7; LXVIII 149-54, 156-9, 162-3; LXIX 103-5; LXX 28-9; LXXI 54, 57; LXXIII 256; LXXXI 180, 188

Tertullian: II 34; XVII 33; XXXI 327; XXXVIII 163; XLVI 3; LXXXI 173-4, 188-9; LXXXII 62

Theophrastus: IV 152; XVIII 137; LIII 232; LVI 174-6; LVII 166

Theramenes: V 45-7

Thrasea Paetus: XL 431, 435-6, 438; XLI 73-5, 78; XLII 141; LXVII 197

Thucydides: I 167, 174-6; III 211-14; IV 151, 153-5; V 35-6, 39, 42, 44, 47; VI 43

Tiberius: XXXVII 110, 114; XL 425-6; XLI 75, 80-1; XLIV 87, 89, 94-6; LXV 45; LXVII 195-6; LXVIII 155-8, 162-3; LXIX 104; LXX 29; LXXX 163-72

Tibullus: XVI 463

Tigellinus: XVIII 138; XX 188; XXIII 35; XXXV 307-9, 312; XXXVIII 162-3; XL 435-7; XLI 72, 75, 77, 79; XLII 129, 137, 142; XLIV 85, 89; XLV 44; LXVIII 161

Tigellius: XVI 461

Titus: LXIX 104

Trajan: XXXV 306-12; XXXVIII 163; XL 425; XLI 71-2, 75, 80: XLII 135; LIV 117; LIX 212; LXVII 194-5; LXVIII 152, 159, 161-3; LXIX 105; LXXX 166; LXXXI 177, 187; LXXXII 67

Trimalchio: XVIII 136-8; XXI 87-97; XXIV 173-5; XXV 363; XXVI 46-7; XXVII 145; XXXI 327; XXXIV 252-3; XXXVII 111; XLI 74; LXVII 199; LXVIII 150; LXIX 105

Tryphaena: XXII 295; XXIX 53-7

Turnus: XXXIX 57-60

Ulpian: LXIV 21, 24, 29-36, 38, 41-2; LXV 37, 42, 45

Umbricius: XXXVI 101

Varro: XXVIII 402; LXIV 38; LXXIX 783, 788

Varus: LXV 38, 47-8

Vatinius: XVIII 135, 139

Velleius Paterculus: XXIV 173-5; XXVI 46; XLV 44; LXVI 289

Verginius Rufus: XL 437; XLI 70-1, 77, 81; XLII 143

Vespasian: XL 429; XLI 71-2, 78-80; XLIV 84, 87; LXIV 41; LXVII 199; LXVIII 152, 163; LXIX 104

Vestinus: XVIII 135; XLIV 87

Virgil: IX 146; XI 345; XVI 463, 465; XXII 295; XXXV 311; XXXVI 102; XXXVIII 163-4; XLII 144; XLIII 144, 149-50; L 22-7; LI 8; LIII 330; LIV 119; LXIV 23; LXXIII 256; LXXVII 280; LXXVIII 181-2; LXXIX 786, 789

Vitellius: XLI 70, 72, 78: XLII 131, 141; LXVIII 154; LXIX 104; LXXX 166

Xenophon: V 35, 39, 41, 44-7; XI 340; XV 9-10; XLVI 3

Zoilus: LXV 48